PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND EARLY CRITICISMS

A. S. GARRETSON

W.C.BHR Nett
2G15 SE 5.St
es.
A.

BR 165 .G3 Garretson
Primitive Christianity and early criticisms

Unity School Library
Lee's Summit, Missouri 64063

UNITY LIBRARY & ARCHIVES
Primitive Christianity and earl
BR 165 .G3
0 0051 0034405 3

PROPERTY OF
MARGARET BARNETT WILLIAMS

b 13 (Jacob) Faith makes no investiga-
tion does not question authority, nor the
merit or error of propositions.
184 Prayer - good Statement of what it is
40 Books of New Testament decided upon
193 - These are the greatest men who
ever lived metic tests of times
Socrates Plato etc
6 - Def of Religion Abbot, Max Muller
Matheu Arnold -
4 Miracles Vespasian - Appolonius of
Tyana - Josephus (Sea of Pamphylia)
10. Ressurrections
Arestias of Proconnessus lived rise
ex twice from the dead
also Adonis - Aphrodite Tammuz
Ishtar - (The Phrygian God Atis
11 rose on fourth day)

11 - Mithraism

32 Evils and vices are settled dis-
positions contrary to right reason
and proceed from ignorance

204 Prayer of Socrates - Comp with
Christian or "Jewish"

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND EARLY CRITICISMS

(A WORK OF NEGATION)

BY

A. S. GARRETSON

SECOND EDITION

BOSTON
SHERMAN, FRENCH & COMPANY
1912

UNITY SCHOOL LIBRARY
Unity Village
Lee's Summit, Missouri 64063

Copyright, 1912
Sherman, French & Company

BR
165
G192p

TO
THE MEMORY OF
PROFESSOR H. C. POWERS
CURATOR OF THE ACADEMY OF
SCIENCE AND LETTERS OF
SIOUX CITY, IOWA.

It is conceivable that religion may be morally useful without being intellectually sustainable.

—*J. S. Mill.*

Is there a unity between universal mind and external nature?

—*Aristotle.*

How can that which is eternal be created in time?

—*Bishop Berkeley.*

Do "right" and "wrong" exist by nature or by institution?

The fierceness of the lion is not expended in fighting with its own kind; the sting of the serpent is not aimed at the serpent; the monsters of the sea, and the fishes, vent their rage only on those of a different species. But with man,—by Hercules! most of his misfortunes are occasioned by man.

—*Pliny.*

CHAPTER HEADS

PROLOGUE

I

HISTORICAL SUMMARY

JESUS — PAUL — THE GOSPELS — FATHERS OF THE CHURCH — THE NICENE COUNCIL — THE REFORMATION

II

CRITICISMS

PHILO — JUSTUS — JOSEPHUS — PLINY — PLUTARCH — SENECA — TACITUS — PLINY, THE CONSUL — LUCIAN — SUETONIUS — JUVENAL — APULEIUS — EUSEBIUS — CELSUS — JULIAN

III

SIBYLLINE BOOKS—THE LOGOS—NEOPLATONISM—MOHAMMEDANISM

IV

THE SCHOOLS OF GREECE

V

PARALLELS—EARLY BELIEFS—MIRACULOUS CONCEPTIONS

VI

THE NAZARENE CHURCH

VII

"STROMATA"

APOTHEOSIS — THE RESURRECTION — ARIANISM — "THEOTOKOS" — THE TRINITY.

VIII

DUALISM

CONTENTS

PROLOGUE

	Page
AGNOSTICISM	18
BELIEFS	7
FAITH	12
MARTYRDOM	11
MARTYRDOM OF ST. VINCENT	17
POLYTHEISM	13
PROPHECY	12
RELICS	16
RITES	10

CHAPTER I

ATTITUDE OF CONSTANTINE, THE	36
ATTITUDE OF HADRIAN, THE	34
DECREE OF MILAN	42
FATHERS OF THE CHURCH	26
GREEK CHURCH, THE	44
GOSPEL, ORAL AND TRADITIONAL	28
INSPIRATION	31
NAZARENES, THE	28
NEW TESTAMENT CANON, THE	40
NICENE COUNCIL AND CREED	36
SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	24

CHAPTER II

CRITICISMS:

Apuleius	98
Aurelius	69
Celsus	70
Dionysius	100
Domitian	66
Epictetus	58
Eusebius	100
Hierocles	69
Josephus	49
Julian	97
Justinus	65
Justus	46
Juvenal	63

CONTENTS

Page

Lucian 66
Martial 65
Numenius 99
Philo 45
Phlegon 99
Pliny 49
Pliny, the Consul 58
Plutarch 58
Seneca 47
Suetonius 65
Tacitus 61
Talmud, The 47
Trajan, Emperor 61
EXTANT LETTERS OF JESUS 101
GREEK TEXT OF THE GOSPEL CHANGED 55
LOGOS, THE 46

CHAPTER III

LOGOS, THE 106
MOHAMMEDANISM 113
NEOPLATONISM 108
SARACEN PHILOSOPHERS 119
SIBYLLINE BOOKS 103

CHAPTER IV

AQUINAS, ST. THOMAS, ATTITUDE OF 153
CHRISTIAN ETHICS 183
CYNICS, THE 126
CYRENAIC PHILOSOPHERS, THE 136
DECREE OF GALERIUS 168
EPICUREANS, THE 135
ETHICS OF HENRY GEORGE, THE 186
ETHICS OF LUCRETIUS 139
ETHICS OF ROUSSEAU, THE 189
ETHICS OF THOS. JEFFERSON, THE 190
HUMANISTS, THE 151
INQUISITION, THE 173
MARTYRDOM OF:
Bruno 170
Hypatia 170
Huss, John 171
James, the Brother of Jesus 166
Jesus 166
John the Baptist 166

CONTENTS

Page

Justin Martyr 167
Maccabees, The 160
Mani 165
Polycarp 166
Savonarola 172
Servetus 171
Socrates 156
St. Cyprian 168
Stephen 166
PERIPATETICISM AT BAGDAD 149
PERIPATETICISM AT CORDOVA 150
PERIPATETICS, THE 143
PLATO 125
PLINY THE EPICUREAN 140
PYTHAGOREANS, THE 122
REFORMATION, THE 154
RENAISSANCE, THE 154
SOPHISTS, THE 124
STOICS, THE 129
UTILITARIANISM 185

CHAPTER V

DEMONS 207
EARLY BELIEFS 206
MIRACULOUS CONCEPTIONS 214
MARTYRDOM OF PEREGRIN 207
PARALLELS 194
SUPERNATURAL OCCURRENCES 195
SUPERNATURAL VOICES 211
TWO SACRIFICES MADE TO THE GODS 198
TWO OPINIONS.—ATHANASIUS AND HIEROCLES . 200

CHAPTER VI

CHARACTER OF EARLY PREACHING 240
DESCENDANTS OF JESUS 238
GOSPELS OF GENTILE ORIGIN 236
NAZARENE CHURCH, THE 238

CHAPTER VII

APOTHEOSIS 243
ARIANISM 254
BIOGRAPHY OF APOLLONIUS, BY PHILOSTRATUS 244
PARALLEL FROM LUCIAN 268

CONTENTS

Page

PERSONATION OF JESUS ON THE STAGE AT ALEXANDRIA 270
RESURRECTION, THE 249
THEOTOKOS 259
TRINITY, THE 266
TWO GREEK ADJECTIVES 258

CHAPTER VIII

DUALISM 273

PROLOGUE

Christianity embraces the best ethical thought and precepts of any system of religion, that has thus far been conceived. It has elevated man by giving him elevated ideals. Whether its esoteric doctrines be true or not makes no difference in its effect on living men; it is the splendid idealism of Christianity that makes men better, for men are in degree good as they in degree follow, portray and live good ideals.

Cicero states that,—"Rome was victorious over the Carthagenians and the Greeks because Rome believed in the immortal gods." The wise and humane Pliny always began the day's business, whether in the Roman Senate or in the seclusion of his estate at Laurentum, with "grateful prayer and invocation to the gods." These men were good, because their thoughts and their ideals were good. The prophet said truly: "As a man thinketh so is he."

MYSTICISM

At the outset, the state of mind which prevailed among the masses of the people over the Roman Empire, at the time Jesus lived and taught in Judea should be considered. It was an age of superstition. The learned and illiterate alike worshiped the gods, or the forces of nature which

the gods represented. Only a few philosophers, largely those of the Greek schools, had a higher conception of the Author of the Universe and His laws, and their conceptions were generally couched in the most abstruse propositions. It was an age of hero worship. Augustus had been apotheosized, and a temple built in Rome for his formal worship. All the emperors of Rome from Augustus to Constantine claimed divine honors of their subjects. The people everywhere bowed at the shrine of renown and power. We know, too, that it is characteristic of human nature that, as we recede from an impressive event, its glamour becomes more pronounced; that our imaginations paint it in brighter colors and give to it a more exaggerated form and meaning. This is especially true of all tradition, and the poet has well said: "Distance lends enchantment to the view."

We shall see that Peter, "The stone on which the Christian Church is built," in common with many others of his associates, could neither read nor write; and that, "Mark was his interpreter." We shall also ascertain that the gospel was an oral gospel, without form and without creed, until Paul began to write his epistles, about thirty-two years after the crucifixion of Jesus; and that the Synoptic gospels were written much later. It also appears that St. Luke,—author of the third gospel and of the "Acts of the Apostles"—St. Mark,—author of the second

gospel—and the apostle Paul, had neither seen nor heard Jesus and depended wholly on tradition for their information touching Him and His life and teachings. If Paul had not carried the gospel to the Gentiles, the religion of Jesus would have been confined to a sect of the Jews. Jesus gave his command to the twelve disciples, saying: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." After His resurrection, He is said to have given a more general commission, but, as between the two commands, we should hold to the former one made in the flesh.

It will be apparent, too, that the New Testament canon was made from an accumulation of sacred writings, and that decision was reached by majority vote of the delegates present at the councils of Hippo and Carthage, A. D. 393-397. Up to that time, no authoritative canon existed. One made earlier, without authority and general consent, was known as "The Muratorian Fragment," A. D. 170, which does not concur, however, with the New Testament canon as now made up.

There were no gospels written until after Nero's persecution of the sect known, in Judea, as the "Nazarenes," and in the Asiatic provinces and probably in Rome also, as "Christians." The coloring which this persecution gave to the views of those who wrote the gospels, while under its influence, or in its environment, must be consid-

ered, as well as tradition with its natural sequence.

It is easy to determine what would naturally and ultimately follow from one credulous man relating the miraculous occurrences in the work and life of Jesus to another credulous man, and the latter, in turn, relating those events to an assemblage of credulous men, and so on, for thirty-two or more years, when Paul's epistles appeared, and from that time on, until the Synoptic gospels were written, when the works and doctrines of Jesus, as interpreted, not by the Nazarene Christians, but rather by Gentile converts and Greek theologians, had crystallized into form. The moral precepts and ethical conceptions taught by Jesus, would likely not be exaggerated by recounting them from year to year, as these would not stimulate the imaginations of men as did the accounts of the miracles said to have been wrought by Jesus; therefore, we probably have the moral precepts substantially as given by Him.

An historian of that time relates circumstances of Emperor Vespasian having cured a lame man; of having given back sight to a blind man, and of having wrought many and various miraculous cures, all in much the same manner, too, as Jesus is reported to have done. The historian Philostratus relates how Apollonius of Tyana raised the dead body of a woman to life, in Rome; and Josephus relates, with all seriousness, that the Sea of Pamphylia opened to let Alexander and his army pass through. We certainly do not

believe these reports, though coming from accredited historians. Why, then, should we believe accounts of unnatural and unreasonable occurrences coming down to us from tradition, and, perchance, colored by religious enthusiasm?

It is also to be borne in mind that many ante-Nicene theologians did not esteem Jesus to be more than a prophet and teacher; nor did the historians of His time believe that He possessed the characteristics which were accorded, or ascribed, to Him; first, by a coterie of friends and acquaintances, and later, in a more formal manner, by the apostles.

Understanding these conditions and circumstances, an effort may be made properly to estimate the value of Christian doctrine as it relates to supernatural occurrences, to inspiration and to its many unusual claims. Any proposition outside of and beyond human experience and understanding cannot be accepted with safety or confidence.

ATTITUDE

Every religion has created its God. The Jews probably had the best ideals, and therefore created the best Deity of any people. But when the magnitude and complexity of this world of matter,—the grandeur of the solar system, with its eight major planets moving swiftly in orderly paths around the sun; and the illimitable expanse of space, with its uncounted systems of suns and planets, are considered, the anthro-

pomorphous God of the Jews does not rise to a true conception of the Creator and Master of the Universe. The majority of Christian people, when they lift up their thoughts and voices in prayer, have before their minds a more exalted Being than the God of Moses and Aaron.

Many worship an Ideal—an Ethical Ideal. Some personify this Ideal and call the personification "Jesus."

Lyman Abbott says:—"In worship we have a personal perception of the Infinite." Yet who has perceived the Infinite?

Max Muller states: "Religion is a perception of the Infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of man." Can any one say truly that the Infinite Being has manifested Himself to him? In the final analysis of worship, a proper value must be put upon our emotions and our judgment, and then choose between them. We may at this point inquire: are the emotions primary sources of moral life? Or, are they not rather the primary sources of religious life? Morality being older and better than religion, a religion is good only so far as it is supported by morality. We may, therefore, affirm that morality is born of the judgment and experience of the race, and is independent of religious belief.

Matthew Arnold holds: "Religion is conduct touched by emotion." This definition fits an ideal religion, but Christianity is something more

than this, it is "conduct touched by emotion," plus supernaturalism. It is this supernaturalism in Christianity that I seek to oppose. I have no serious criticisms to make of the ethical teachings of Christianity.

BELIEFS

It is a primary proposition in logic which affirms that "where there is contradiction there is falsehood." The early Christian Fathers were ever in disagreement in the interpretation of Christian doctrine and held contrary opinions touching the personality and attributes of Jesus.

The decrees of the early Church councils affirmed radically different doctrine from age to age. Doctrinal propositions that were considered and condemned as heretical at Antioch in the third century, became the cardinal articles in the creed made at Nicaea a century later. The doctrine held and advocated by Origen and Tertullian in the second century was largely condemned by Athanasius, Lactantius and St. Augustine in the fourth century. Each group was, in its day, the embodiment of orthodox Christianity.

An early body of Christians held that Jesus was divine, only from the moment of His baptism. Another body of Christians baptized its converts in the name of Jesus only, and did not regard the claims of Nazarene Christianity seriously. The Marcionites and the followers of

Appels, did not believe the Jewish scriptures, but worshiped Jesus as a divinity. The Docetae believed that Jesus had only a phantom body, that His crucifixion had an appearance only, and that there could have been no physical suffering and resurrection. There were five different bodies of Christians, during the first three centuries, which held to this view, on the ground that it is irrational to believe that the Godhead could have suffered. The Ebionites, a Jewish sect, organized immediately after the crucifixion of Jesus, if not previous thereto, accepted the moral teachings of Jesus, but denied that His conception and birth were miraculous. The Carpocratians, a body of Alexandrian Christians, believed in the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, that the greatest wisdom and power were possessed by him who could remember and cherish his former incarnations, and who possessed an unshaken faith in a final reunion with God. They conceived Jesus to have been such a one. Many of the Gnostic Christians held to this belief.

The Montanists, A. D. 200, opposed institutional, or Catholic, Christianity and sought guidance by and through their own Gentile prophets. With them prophecy was to continue until Jesus and the millennium should come. There were three prophets that arose in this body of Christians. One of the Montanist churches in Phrygia became an oracle similar to the pagan oracle at Dodona and spake as the Sibyls had

spoken. The doctrines and precepts were good, but the means employed to proclaim them were fraudulent. The Montanist body of Christians was very strong and pointed with pride, in the fourth century, to its considerable accessions of bishops and influential theologians from the Catholic body, and to the large number of its martyrs. The Valentinians, a very important body of Christians (A. D. 140), held that the conceptions of Christianity were symbolic only. The Manichaeans united Gnostic Christianity with Buddhism. The great St. Augustine was a member of this cult for nine years. Justinian, the Christian emperor, decreed the death penalty against all his subjects of this faith, as earlier emperors had done against orthodox Christians. This sect accepted the Jewish scriptures, but denied the divinity of Jesus, and the same may be said of the Mohammedans, who came on four centuries later. The Sabellians were not in accord with the Athanasians on the subject of the trinity, and the Arians opposed the Trinitarians bitterly a half century later. With the exception of the Manichaeans and the Mohammedans, these, and other sects, which might be referred to, were all important Christian bodies of the first three centuries, or up to A. D. 325.

The military forces of the empire, under Constantine, were unable to suppress these numerous sects, though such suppression was often attempted, not always, however, in the interest of

orthodox, or Catholic, Christianity. The Inquisition, a thousand years later, was futile in its efforts to suppress widely divergent and radical opinions that opposed Catholic Christianity. Threats of eternal punishment did not deter, nor did the hopes of salvation held out by the orthodox Church cajole dissenters from their course. Pope Boniface wrote to Philip, king of France: "Every human being is subject to the Roman Pontiff and to believe this is necessary to salvation." This was not the last innovation in Christian doctrine, but I will not here pursue this subject.

RITES

With reference to the rites and mysteries of the Christian Church, which were introduced into it largely by Gentile Christians and Greek theologians, there is reason to believe that much was taken from the mythologies of that and earlier ages by these converts, and that Nazarene Christianity was transformed and molded by Gentile Christians and scholars into the likeness of the polytheism of their ancestors. A trinity had been worshiped in Samothrace. Baptism had been practiced in the worship of Isis. Redemption by sacrifice, mediation of the Logos, immortality of the soul, the resurrection, the last judgment, were cardinal articles of faith in the worship of Mithra. This religion had been taught in Persia for four centuries before Jesus,

and was continued in Rome until the fourth century, when, after an almost equal struggle with Christianity for supremacy in the Roman world it was discontinued. Epigrams of the second century are extant charging Christians with plagiarizing the doctrines of this cult. Aristeas of Proconnesus had risen twice from the dead and had been worshiped! A resurrection had been affirmed in the ceremony of the ancient worship of Adonis and Aphrodite and of Tammuz and Ishtar. The Phrygian god Attis, born of a Virgin, rose from the dead on the fourth day, and his resurrection was yearly celebrated for centuries; and, as of martyrdoms, they were not unknown at the feasts of Bacchus and at the Olympic games. The early Christians, too, in many instances sought martyrdom. In the second and third centuries, Christians had come to regard martyrdom as a rite of the Christian communities—not a voluntary rite to be performed, but one that, under certain circumstances and conditions, should be cheerfully suffered. Tertullian said: "Let the ungulae tear us, the cross bear our weight, the flames envelop us, the sword divide our throats, the wild beasts spring upon us; the very posture of prayer is a preparation for every punishment. These things, so far from being a terror, are rather a pleasure to us." Ignatius affirms his desire for martyrdom in his "Epistle to the Trallians," and prays that he may become worthy of it. Many of the Church

Fathers maintained the same attitude, which the Roman magistrates could not understand.

PROPHECY

In the closing years of the reign of Aurelius, bishops were preaching in the catacombs at Rome, Carthage, Cyrene and Alexandria of the approaching end,—the world was soon to be consumed by fire. Appeal was made to the gospels and to the Sibyls—to Christian prophecy and to heathen oracle. The Sibyls had become Jewish, and now Christian. The zeal with which the Christians preached this doctrine brought fright and panic to the masses. The Sibyls had not been forgotten, Christian prophecy alone could not move the people, but the Sibyls had spoken from time to time for six centuries and their foreboding voices brought alarm and consternation. Human sacrifices were made in Rome to the gods that the impending catastrophe might be averted. As the prediction failed, great honor was accorded the gods and Christian prophecy discredited.

FAITH

Gentile Christianity developed the doctrine of faith; the Gentiles received it first from Paul. This doctrine had become such an important factor in orthodox Christianity by the eleventh century that Archbishop Hildebert of Tours declared: "Faith is above reason." This assumption appeared to settle the case. Tertullian, who

in the second century had been quite as dogmatic, said: "No more philosophy! no more books! after Jesus, science is useless!" Faith makes no investigation; it does not question authority, nor the truth or error of propositions. It opposes reflection. It opposes experimentation. It opposes reforms. It abets superstition. It is the refuge of ignorance and indolence. It would give repose by bidding us, "Let well enough alone," whereas it is through energy and unrest that we seek truth and pursue it. Through the doctrine of applied faith all forms of deception and error are made possible to a credulous subject.

POLYTHEISM

The world has ever been largely polytheistic. Confining our consideration to the Aryans of western Asia and their descendants,—the Europeans and ourselves—and to the gods of Homer and Hesiod,—the divinities of Egypt, Phoenicia, Greece and Rome; let us first determine whether the act of worship is the child or the parent of superstition. What influences lead men to worship? Primarily the feeling of fear. Otherwise we would not make sacrifices. Remove from the minds of Christians the fear of judgment and of hell, and Christianity must change her postulates and ideals at once, else the God of Moses soon will have gone with Jupiter, Jesus with Sarapis, Mary with Isis. Fear and piety are qualities inherent in the human mind. These beget worship,

the form of which is determined by convention, and this by the character and amount of education and degree of civilization attained. The Greeks were pleased to believe that the gods were present and hovered in the air above them at Troy, and fought with them at Thermopylae. Treaties were solemnized by appeal to the gods, as being present. The treaty made by Philip and Hannibal calls the gods to witness: "In the presence of Jupiter, Juno and Apollo; in the presence of the deity of the Carthaginians, and of Hercules and of Iolus; in the presence of Mars, Triton, and Neptune; and in the presence of all the gods who are with us in the camp." The Macedonian kings of Egypt believed the God of the Jews to be the same as Zeus of the Greeks, and Jupiter of the Romans. It is, however, remarkable that a belief in the personality of the gods should have continued long and found lodgment in the minds of the emperors of Rome. Marcus Aurelius, being the best educated and the most enlightened of all the early emperors, his "Meditations" evince a well informed and well disposed mind. This work is a summing up of Stoic doctrine and compares well in moral tone and expression with the "Sermon on the Mount." It is sad and disappointing to see this well informed man bending under the weight of the popular superstitions of his age. He says: "To those who ask, where hast thou seen the gods, or how dost thou comprehend that they exist and so

worshipest them? I answer, in the first place, that they may be seen even with the eyes; in the second place, neither have I seen my own soul, and yet I honor it. Thus then with respect to the gods, from what I constantly experience of their power, from this I comprehend that they exist, and I venerate them." And on the subject of future life, Aurelius continues: "But to go away from among men, if there are gods, is not a thing to be afraid of, for the gods will not involve thee in evil; but if indeed they do not exist, or if they have no concern about human affairs, what is it to me to live in a universe devoid of gods or devoid of Providence? But in truth they do exist, and do care for human things and they have put the means in man's power to enable him not to fall into real evil." It may be said, however, that superstition is no more pronounced in Aurelius than in the writings of the Christian bishops and theologians of that period.

Judaism is of another race,—it is Semitic. When the doctrines of the Nazarene sect were stripped of their Jewish garb at Antioch and there presented to the Gentiles by Paul, their Semitic and monotheistic conceptions and exclusive character were, in a measure, retained,—Judaism and Christianity refused to become Aryan and make a shrine in the Pantheon. This exclusiveness and bigotry brought on the contest long waged in the Roman empire between Semitic Christianity and Aryan polytheism; between

Christians and the adherents of all the other systems or cults; between Christian morality and the ethics of the schools of Greece. The emperors, therefore, became prejudiced against the Christians because they separated themselves from their fellowmen and held aloof from all the social and civic life of the empire; because, while worshiping a trinity, they ridiculed with sarcasm and hate the system of polytheistic worship, then held venerable and sacred by the most enlightened and civilized peoples of the world; treated with derision and contempt the gods whom the scholars of that time admired for the idealism and naturalism of which they were symbolic, and whom the masses adored in faith and consecration.

The magistrates of Rome would have opposed no objections, would have instituted no prosecutions had the Christians built their temples, instituted their mysteries and ritual as other cults had done, without arrogating to themselves all of religion, and without assuming to be the sole servitors of God and righteousness. Polytheism was liberal and generous; monotheism exclusive and bigoted.

RELICS

The superstitious character of Christianity is painfully disclosed in relic worship, which is an exaggerated expression of the tender emotions we have for the dead. It is analogous to ancestor-worship and akin to hero-worship. It manifests emotionalism beyond the control of reason.

It evinces superstition broken away from the moorings of restraint and common-sense. This superstition did not develop until after Christianity had come forth from the catacombs, where it had found asylum and was domiciled for the greater part of two centuries.

By the fifth century, the traffic in the bones of saints had grown to such importance and magnitude that, in Rome, no dead man was safe. Catacombs and basilicas were ransacked, inscriptions defaced, crypts broken into and sarcophagi plundered. The church finally undertook to stop this vandalism and vicious traffic. Pope Stephen III published a letter, purporting to come from Saint Peter, menacing "with eternal damnation the violators of the hallowed tombs."

The adoration of relics was called "pollution" by the un-Christian emperor—Julian. St. Jerome held to the sanctity of relics, "around which the souls of martyrs are constantly hovering to hear the prayers of the supplicants." Later, the blood of martyrs was esteemed a talisman of great power. The Christian spectators of the martyrdom of St. Vincent dipped their clothes in his blood. "The bones of Polycarp," says one of the Fathers, "are more precious than the richest jewels and more tried than gold." Empress Constantina wrote to Pope Gregory the Great, at the end of the sixth century, for the head of St. Paul, in order, "with more solemnity to consecrate a new church." Gregory replied, in effect,

that he could not divide the bodies of the saints and declared that "the danger of invading their tombs is sometimes even fatal"! Martin of Tours narrated how he discovered, by summoning the ghost of a supposed martyr, that the revered relics were only those of a thief. The Church of St. Prassede, Rome, holds in its collection of relics a part of the Crown of Thorns, and there are two whole Crowns of Thorns possessed by two churches in France; by a "miracle" all are said to be genuine. Empress Helena, mother of Constantine the Great, is said to have secured the Cross on which Jesus was crucified. After the crusade it was said that in Europe the fragments of the "true Cross" were sufficient to "freight a ship." Tradition recounts much for the efficacy of relics,—how the remains of saints healed the sick, converted heretics and raised the dead!

AGNOSTICISM

Those who possess their minds free from influences of environment and suggestion, and have the disposition and ability to observe, investigate and reflect; to question, consider and think; and yet again and again to think, ever come to the border land of uncertainty where they must confess, if honest with themselves, that, with the limitations which still beset them they do not know whence they came, or whither they go. After nineteen centuries of Christian civilization and learning, in Europe and the West, we fall back on Lucretius of old, taking his words fresh

and pregnant with life as from his lips, confessing that we do not know "what lies behind the flaming ramparts of the world."

We are a part of the universe, a fragment of the life of the solar system, an integral part of the life of this planet. The glory, or the fate, of the world is ours. We are changing as our environment changes. The great stream of spiritual energy, whether an attribute of matter or existing independently, impregnates all. Six centuries before our era, Heraclitus of Ephesus had observed the transitory character of all things in the realm of Nature and affirmed: "Eternal flux and change are the sole actualities; all phenomena are in a state of continuous transition from non-existence to existence and *vice versa*." And Walter Pater interprets Epicurean doctrine, which bears on this subject, thus: "Conceded that what is secure in our experience is but the sharp apex of the present moment between two hypothetical eternities, and all that is real in our experience but a series of fleeting impressions." Truth is relative, however, and Epicurean doctrine should be so interpreted; rather, we are a part of a scheme that is transcendently grand, it is our privilege and should be our greatest glory to be sensible of this. The younger Pliny possessed this feeling of unity with the world, and in writing to his friend, Tacitus, of the destruction of the cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii, the ruin of Campania, the three days of darkness and the creeping earth beneath his feet,—occasioned by the eruption of

Vesuvius, of which he was witness,—says: "My support was grounded in that miserable, though mighty consolation, that all mankind were involved in the same calamity, and that I was perishing with the world itself."

Man has risen from a low condition to his present state, and a higher plane awaits him. He possesses attributes which prophesy and assure this. His inquiring mind, his restless spirit, and his thirst for knowledge promise much. He will soon have freed his mind from the dominion of superstition, and his body from the thraldom of despotic government. The cruelty and license of Rome, under her emperors, largely came with the change of government, crime with imperialism, apostacy from sturdy virtue—with empire and wealth. If, under the Republic, Rome was peccant, under the Empire she became a public plunderer and a heroic thief. If, under the rule of the Senate and Tribune, her hands were sometimes stained with fratricidal blood, under the Cæsars they became incarnadine. Under the Republic, she banished tyrants; under the Empire, she expelled philosophers, exiled her best citizens, expatriated Jews and sacrificed Christians. The crimes of the Empire were not due to its polytheism; it was impossible that there could exist side by side master and slave, patrician and plebeian, citizen and subject. Man's greatest happiness and glory will not be realized in Religion but in Democracy.

I

HISTORICAL SUMMARY

It is the purpose of this investigation to ascertain what evidence there is, outside the Gospels, of the life, teachings and death of Jesus. It has also been my purpose to ascertain the extent, and probable dates, of the writings which were regarded as authoritative by the "Fathers of the Church," to determine whether the earliest of the "Fathers of the Church" were connected in any way with the apostles, to examine the several important events in the early history of the Church; and, lastly, to analyze the criticisms made by contemporaneous writers, of the Christian religion and of its founders.

There can be no doubt that Jesus was born in Judea in the year of Rome 749, which is equivalent to the year B. C. 4, or at about that date. There is no reason to doubt that He was a teacher of influence, that He drew many unto Him, and that because His doctrines were new and not altogether in keeping with the Mosaic law (which law had the authority of the prefixes, "Thus saith the Lord," and "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying") and because He forgave sins and performed many wonders and professed to be able to do many unusual things, the Sanhedrin of the

Jews condemned Him, the Roman procurator acquiesced in the judgment, and He was crucified. His crucifixion appears to have taken place in the month of March, A. D. 29. The doctrines He taught, the circumstances of His life and the fellowship had with His disciples, were deeply impressed on the minds of many who followed Him, and they paid Him divine honors.

Following the crucifixion, the disciples of Jesus began to teach in the synagogues. They taught that Jesus was the "Messiah" foretold by the prophets, and they charged the Pharisees with having wickedly put Him to death. These meetings were generally broken up in tumult, the disciples taken before the Sanhedrin, tried and beaten, or otherwise punished. Later, in the case of Stephen, we learn that he was stoned to death. These things continued for about two years. The High Priest now began a systematic persecution of the members of the "New Sect." About this time, Paul of Tarsus appeared as one also active in persecuting and prosecuting them. While on this mission, Paul was converted, as we learn from his testimony, and at Damascus was baptized. Retiring to the wilderness in Arabia, he appears to have spent some time before returning to Damascus and beginning his ministry. He at once began teaching and preaching to the Jews the doctrines which Jesus had taught, though he had not known Jesus, nor heard these new doctrines from Him. Paul soon went before

the Gentiles, preaching and establishing churches. He threw the Jewish ceremonial laws aside and opened the way to the Gentiles "through faith." Peter seems to have had a vision which brought him to believe that the doctrines of Jesus should be presented to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, though he advocated that the Gentiles should conform to the ceremonials of the Jews, especially in the matter of eating meat, circumcision and purification. It is interesting to contemplate what course the doctrines of Jesus would have taken had not Paul presented these doctrines to the Gentiles, and had not Peter had the vision, after which he sought to open the door to the Gentiles by first making Jews of them. The Gentiles at Antioch accepted the doctrines of Christianity as presented by Paul, and the converts at Antioch were the first to be called "Christians." This was about nine or ten years after the crucifixion of Jesus. The apostles at Jerusalem were pursuing their missionary work among the Jews, and Paul was establishing churches among the Gentiles. About A. D. 64, or thirty-five years after the crucifixion, the first written "Gospels" appeared in the form of his epistles to the several churches, which he had established. Paul does not anywhere refer to the New Testament Scriptures, or to any part of them; from which, and for other reasons, we may infer that no such written Scriptures were then, nor, until some years after the burning of Rome and the first persecution of

Christians by Nero, in existence. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the gospel was an oral gospel only, from the time of the crucifixion down to the writing of the Synoptics, unless Paul's epistles may be regarded as gospels. The Synoptic gospels (those attributed to Matthew, Mark and Luke) were written about A. D. 80, or about fifty-one years after the crucifixion of Jesus, embodying in permanent form an account of the life and teachings of Jesus. Competent critics [1] agree in the opinion that the gospel attributed to Mark was the first to be written, that Matthew followed and added much which Mark had omitted, and that Luke wrote last. It is evident that Luke did not write until after the fall of Jerusalem, and Renan is of the opinion that Matthew, as well, did not write until after that event.

The gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew; those of Mark and Luke in Greek. Matthew was a disciple of Jesus; Mark and Luke were not disciples or apostles, for they had not known or seen Jesus. These gospels agree in part. They are not contradictory in any particular. It is a marvelous circumstance that the teachings of Jesus were not reduced to writing and carefully edited soon after His crucifixion. Two reasons for this neglect may be deduced; first, that His disciples were ignorant men; and, second, that belief in the early second coming of Jesus was established in the minds of the disciples, and therefore records

[1] Abbott—Renan—Ewald.

of His ministry were considered unnecessary.

St. Luke was with Paul and Barnabas in their ministry at Rome; many years after this, St. Luke wrote his gospel and the "Acts of the Apostles." The "Revelations" seem to have preceded the Synoptic gospels, while the fourth gospel (that of St. John) apparently was not written until early in the second century. The character of this work is quite different from that of the other gospels comprised in the New Testament. It clearly shows the influence of the Alexandrian schools, in thought and expression, especially in the doctrine of the "Logos," developed by Philo. The New Testament books, with the exception of Matthew, were written in the Greek. The language in use in Judea in the time of Jesus was Aramaic and, to some extent, Greek. Hebrew had not been spoken by the Jews of Palestine for two hundred years and the "Hebrew Scriptures" in use at that time were the Greek translation known as the Septuagint.

Coming now to the last quarter of the first century, we hear nothing of the gospels, as yet, from any source. Paul appears to have been lost in the persecution by Nero, in A. D. 64,— "beheaded without the gate on the Ostian Way." Barnabas and the apostles, with the exception of John, have passed away, and the orthodox Jews have persistently opposed the Christian doctrines and persecuted the Christians. Up to this time the Roman governors were ignorant of the doctrines of the

Christians, and prosecuted them for infractions of the Roman laws only. It was unlawful, in the Roman empire, for a considerable number to assemble without license. The edicts of the emperors demanding that divine honors should be paid them were laws made to be obeyed. The Christians disobeyed, or ignored, these laws, and the orthodox Jews were quick to inform on them and so prosecutions followed.

John was now living at Ephesus, and a young man by the name of "Polycarp," born near there in A. D. 69, was a pupil of his. Another young man was born in that locality in A. D. 70, named "Papias." These were the first of the early "Fathers of the Church." It is stated by Irenæus, A. D. 120-202, that Papias heard John preach. It is also stated by Eusebius, A. D. 265, that Papias often, while describing events in the lives of the apostles, would use these words: "The elder used to say," and it was understood that he referred to the apostle John who was living up to about A. D. 98, at which time Papias was twenty-eight years old.

In the case of Polycarp, the evidence of his association with the apostle John is much better. The evidence does not come to us through the writings of Polycarp, which are very meager, but through Irenæus, who, as a young man, knew Polycarp and heard him teach and preach. A letter has been preserved, written by Irenæus to his friend, Florinus, which is interesting and full of

touching sentiments: "I saw you" (says Irenæus to Florinus) "when I was yet a boy in lower Asia with Polycarp. . . . I can even point out now the place where the Blessed Polycarp sat and spoke and described his going out and coming in, his manner of life, his personal appearance, the address he delivered to the multitude, how he spoke of his intercourse with John, and with the others who had seen the Lord, and how he recalled their words, and everything he had heard about the Lord; about His miracles and His teaching. Polycarp told us as one who had received it from those who had seen the word of life with their own eyes, and all this in complete harmony with the Scriptures. To this I then listened, through the mercy of God vouchsafed to me, with all eagerness, and wrote it not down on paper, but in my heart, and still, by the grace of God, I ever bring it into fresh remembrance."

I am unable to find that others of the "Fathers of the Church," or those having a place in secular history, excepting Josephus who writes of James, knew any one of the apostles. Nothing stronger than bare conjecture is found to show that Peter, late in life, became bishop of the Church at Rome, and that the Hierarchy of the Roman Church goes back in an unbroken chain to Peter and through him to the apostolic age.[2] Polycarp appears to be

[2] Tertullian implies that the register of the Church at Rome showed that St. Clement was made bishop of that Church by St. Peter. Clement was the third bishop of the Roman Church, however, and not the first.

the one and only well authenticated link that connects the post apostolic age with the apostles.

The "Fathers of the Church" were, almost without exception, men of great ability and fine scholarship. They do not always agree in their opinions and conceptions of Christianity, nor concur in the doctrines of the Church, as we now understand these doctrines. It is impossible to consider here the many and varied interpretations of Scripture made, and the great constructive work done, by the "Fathers of the Church," beginning with Polycarp in the first century and ending with Gregory in the fifth. Aside from the tragedy on Calvary, the work of these great men, the consecration of their lives, and the persecution and martyrdom they suffered, constitute the richest heritage of the Christian Church.

Up to A. D. 96, reference is found nowhere to the gospels, and it is to be inferred that they were still oral and traditional in character. If records or memoranda existed they were in the Aramaic language, the vernacular of Jesus and His disciples. The Church at Jerusalem, established by the apostles soon after the crucifixion and known over Judea and Samaria as "The Sect of the Nazarene," had now been in existence for sixty-five years, and apparently had not in all these years known of, or possessed, the Synoptic gospels.

It is stated by Irenæus that Polycarp was made bishop of the Church at Smyrna by the apostle

John. It is not known at what time this appointment was made, but presumably it was early in Polycarp's life; at all events, Polycarp occupied this position until A. D. 155, when he suffered martyrdom. It is to be observed, however, that Polycarp has nowhere mentioned the gospels in any of his writings. It is, therefore, to be inferred that he knew nothing of them, and that he used the traditional narrative in all his ministry.

Papais (A. D. 70-156), writing about A. D. 140, mentions the gospels of Matthew and Mark, but places a higher value on the traditional narrative than on the more circumscribed account given in these gospels. He states, "the gospels are inadequate." He mentions, too, many miracles wrought by Jesus, but not found in the gospels. He gives the interesting information that "Mark recorded from memory the testimonies of Peter," and that "Mark never saw or knew Jesus but received his information from Peter." He states also: "Matthew wrote his scriptures in Hebrew and each man interpreted them as best he could."

Justin Martyr, born at Rome about A. D. 100, some fifty years later, says: "The memoirs of the apostles were read with the books of the prophets in the several churches," and he esteemed the prophecies most. In his dialogues with Trypho he shows clearly that Jesus was believed to have been "Man of Man" and "The Son of Joseph,"

and that only by a superior and implicit faith in the prophecies can one believe in His supernatural character.

Clement of Rome, A. D. 98, in a letter to the church at Corinth, appears to have quoted from Matthew, but does not anywhere refer to the gospels.

Barnabas, in an epistle written about A. D. 100, or 125, uses words and expressions found in Matthew's gospel, but he also quotes words of Jesus which are nowhere found in the gospels.

The "Shepherd of Hermas," A. D. 135, does not quote from, or refer to, the gospels.

Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 160, evinces a knowledge of the gospels in his works,—"The Homilies." He evidently regarded Christianity a philosophy and was willing to say that Plato had been inspired.

Irenæus, when writing about A. D. 115, quotes some words from the gospels, but not accurately; he also quotes from Jesus words and phrases that are not in our canonical gospels. Later, however, he quotes more fully and accurately from the Synoptic gospels and, apparently, from the fourth gospel as well. It may be said that this early bishop was the first to give historical evidence of the existence of the four gospels; Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and this evidence was not given until well on towards the middle of the second century—a fact not to be lost sight of.

Marcion, A. D. 140, founded a Christian sect,

and used the epistles of Paul, but also quoted from the gospels. Tertullian, born at Carthage A. D. 150, quotes from the fourth gospel authoritatively.

It may be observed that the four gospels under review, which form the groundwork of Christianity, do not sufficiently agree to justify the claim that they are, or were, inspired, which an analysis of their divergencies, or lapses, will show. An inspired account of an occurrence given by one author must concur with a similarly inspired account of the same occurrence given by another author. The Lord's Prayer, for example, is not given in the same words by Matthew as by Luke, and is not mentioned at all by Mark. Was inspiration given to Matthew of a different character, or given to a greater or less degree, than that given to Luke, and did it fail altogether in the person of Mark? Consider the history of the miraculous conception of Jesus. Mark, the earlier writer, makes no mention of this supernatural event. Matthew's account is somewhat different from that of Luke. How can these writers of the gospels have been inspired when they fail to agree upon such an important matter as the record of the miraculous conception of Jesus? The Sermon on the Mount is not mentioned by Mark. Why did inspiration fail in him that he omitted to give this important effusion of ethical doctrine? Matthew apparently wrote later than Mark and he seems to have amended the narrative to make it show a fulfillment of prophecy in the birth and

life of Jesus. In this, was Matthew more inspired than Mark, who, not being a Jew, did not write to that end? Luke implies that "attempts" had been made to set forth a continuous narrative of the things "surely believed," and he mentions a "tradition," which probably was the source of the gospel record. Was he, in this work, more profoundly inspired than those who, preceding him, had attempted this narration and, from his point of view, had failed? Paul states that he received his gospel from the Lord and not from man, and Paul quotes words from Jesus not found in the gospels. This is difficult to understand. Luke was with Paul in his work at Rome and it may be inferred that Luke received his information from Paul rather than by means of inspiration.

The four gospels fall short of being authenticated historical narrative in this: they do not indicate place where written, date when written, nor signatures and attestations of the authors. These defects are regarded by all critics, ancient and modern, as fatal to the authenticity of historical narrative and biography. For example, in the case of the narrative attributed to Matthew, the writer says, "Gospel *according to* Matthew," not *by* Matthew, nor *of* Matthew. This indicates that the narrative was compiled by editors, who assigned the authorship of their work to Matthew. This supposition is strengthened by internal evidence. Had not this gospel been written at a

late date, such expressions as, "to this day," "even to this day," "until this day," would not have been used so frequently.

The authorship of the fourth gospel was legendary as late as A. D. 170. No one knew in those years, nor does anyone know now, who wrote it. The "Muratorian Fragment," A. D. 170-200, states that this gospel was compiled by a number of authors. Many modern critics, well versed in Greek and Latin, having had access to the extant early manuscripts in the Greek text bearing on the authorship of this gospel, aver that it appears to have been compiled at Ephesus by a group of Christian scholars as a revision of the Synoptic gospels. Other books in the New Testament were so written and in like manner the authorship attributed to important personages. The apostle John had long been a striking figure at Ephesus and it was a fitting tribute to this venerable and venerated Jew, at this time deceased, to ascribe this finished and scholarly production to him. This gospel was not taken notice of by any theologians whose writings we have, until after A. D. 150, and it was not frequently and generally referred to until A. D. 180. Irenæus, A. D. 120-202, says, in effect, that this gospel contains statements which are specially intended to remove the error of the Cerinthians and Nicolaitans, the former a Christian body that flourished in Asia Minor in the first quarter of the second century.

With the beginning of the second century, Christianity had taken root in the Roman Empire, supplanting in many localities the older religions of Rome, which had long been associated with the government of the state and empire. The pagan temples were in a measure deserted, the worship of the gods neglected and the government itself was thought to be menaced. Until now, the educated classes and the governors of Rome, had not distinguished Christianity from Judaism, nor Christians from Jews. While the persecutions under Nero and succeeding emperors, down to Trajan (from A. D. 54 to 98), were characterized by unspeakable cruelty, still the governors of Rome regarded the Christians as a Jewish sect. The persecution under Nero was the first to occur, and was an arbitrary persecution, in no degree judicial. There was some trouble earlier, according to the historian Suetonius, which occurred in the reign of Claudius when he drove some four thousand Jews out of Rome, for there were daily riots and turmoil growing out of the effort of the Christian Jews to convert orthodox Jews to Christianity. It does not appear, however, that Claudius discerned any difference between Christian and orthodox Jews; in fact, all Jews looked alike to him and all were equally despised.

By A. D. 132, in the reign of Hadrian, the nature and force of Christianity were fully realized and the danger to the empire understood.

Livy had, long before this, given to the people of Rome, the maxim: "Wherever the religion of any state falls into disregard and contempt, it is impossible for that state to subsist long." This maxim finally proved true, for imperial Rome went down, together with her institutions and her gods, as Christianity became ascendant.

The civil authorities had now become alarmed. The adherents of the old religions were jealous and resentful; the priesthood, in its wrath towards the new religion, urged the emperors to suppress it. The Christians were separatists. They were exclusive. They renounced the world and embraced Christianity with enthusiasm for a life of holiness and asceticism. Rome had rested on the power and prowess of her legions. Her religion was Imperialism and her God was Mars. Christianity wanted no part in secular government nor in military conquests; therefore Christianity menaced the state. Beside, the Roman authorities had heard of the prophecy of the Christians, that an earthly kingdom was soon to come in glory and without end, and thereby their fears were aroused. It was therefore decided to stamp out Christianity. A systematic prosecution, or persecution, of the Christians was instituted and became the policy of the Roman government. These prosecutions reached their greatest extent in Diocletian's reign; it is written that over thirty thousand martyrdoms took place in those years,[3]

[3] Gibbon, however, estimates the number of martyrdoms

and that the property of the Christians was quite generally confiscated and the Christian churches demolished. With the coming of Constantine, in A. D. 313, prosecution of the Christians ceased. Constantine embraced the Christian religion and the empire gave it protection and encouragement.

Now, when annoyance from without had ceased, dissension and strife began within. The necessity was felt of formulating a creed for the purpose of bringing about a uniformity of belief among the theologians and bishops of Christendom. There was at this time a large accumulation of Christian writings which were regarded as "gospels" and generally thought to have been "inspired." From these and other sources a great diversity of opinion prevailed as to what was Christian doctrine and what was not. The schools of Alexandria had interpreted Christian doctrine from many standpoints and had reached many conclusions. From without, Christianity had been influenced by paganism in many ways; from within, by Neo-Platonism, Gnosticism and Montanism. It had become largely an incongruous medley of speculation and superstition. A council of bishops of Christendom was needed and a council was called, at Nicæa, in A. D. 325. Emperor Constantine presided at this council, which lasted over a month and was attended by 318

which occurred under the emperors at about 6000, and says that almost all such cases were had pursuant to judicial process.

bishops. These came from Asia, from Africa, from Judea, from Spain and from Gaul. Some came by ships, some by chariots, some on camels in caravans, and some were carried in chairs and some borne on litters. Many of the latter had literally been snatched as "coals from the burning," for they had felt fire at the stake and their limbs were dead or paralyzed. History nowhere makes mention of a more interesting, a more determined, or a more unique gathering of men, than that which assembled at Nicæa to determine the creed of the Christian church. The deliberations of this body were in Greek. In the end, the radical trinitarian doctrines prevailed and a creed was formulated affirming them. The minority party, the party of protest, was anathematized, and, later, led by one Arius, a presbyter of the church at Alexandria, developed into a considerable body or branch of the Eastern Church, known as "Arians." This early creed is interesting and is given in full: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things, both visible and invisible; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is to say, of the substance of the Father, God of God and Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in Heaven and things on Earth; who, for us men and for our salvation, came down and was made flesh, made

man, suffered and rose again on the third day, went up into the Heavens, and is to come again to judge the quick and the dead; and in the Holy Ghost." Then follows the "Anathema" of Arius and his followers; briefly as follows: "Anathema be they who say, there was a time when Jesus Christ was not," . . . that "Before He was begotten He was not," . . . that "He came into existence from what was not," and that He is of a different "Person" or "Substance." Arius is said to have addressed the bishops in this manner: "A thousand times no! The Son is not co-eternal with the Father, nor of the same substance! Otherwise He would not have said,—'Why call Me good? God only is good.' 'I go to my God, to your God.' And other words attesting his quality to be that of a creature. It is demonstrated to us moreover by His many names: 'Lamb,' 'Shepherd,' 'Fountain,' 'Wisdom,' 'Good way,' 'Prophet,' 'Son of Man,' 'Corner Stone.' And I will call to your minds the fact that this doctrine, which proclaims that Jesus is consubstantial (of like substance) with God, was considered by our venerated and consecrated predecessors at the council of Antioch, in the year 269, and that they decreed it to be both heretical and damnable!" By all this we see how the Greek mind developed subtle inconsistencies and formulated metaphysical propositions that have baffled the wisdom of sixteen succeeding centuries.

This was the second important step in the evo-

lution of Christian doctrine and dogma. The first council of which we know was that held at Jerusalem to which, it is recorded, Paul and Barnabas went from Antioch, and at which it was tacitly agreed that Paul should preach the gospel of "uncircumcision" to the Gentiles, that the Jewish ceremonials should no longer be laid in the way of the neophyte. Peter acquiesced in this departure, but the other apostles did not; except, perhaps, they accorded the right to Paul and Barnabas to do so on their own responsibility. Peter returned to Antioch with Paul and saw the work going on among the Gentiles and approved of it; but when the other apostles of Jerusalem came down to Antioch, Peter withdrew with them, causing a serious rupture between Paul and Peter. It is evident that, had it not been for Paul preaching to the Gentiles, the religion of Jesus would have been confined to the Jews. We know that, later, the converted Jewish Christians could not be reconciled to the admission of Gentiles to be "fellow heirs" with the "Children of the Promise." It is not necessary in this inquiry to consider any save the more important of the numerous councils held by the early Christian theologians and bishops, nor to examine the many "heresies" and "schisms" that called them forth.

Following the secularization of the Church, which occurred when it was taken under the protection of the Roman Empire by Constantine, there was a mighty rush of pagans into it. These new

adherents (we can hardly call them converts) took with them their superstitions, their polytheism, their magic and their images. It was necessary to provide these with access to the Scriptures, that they might learn the doctrines and history of Christianity. Many writings at this time were regarded as sacred and authoritative which did not concur in matters of doctrine. It became necessary to pass upon the character and authority of these numerous writings and thus make an authoritative canon. This work had been undertaken by certain of the Fathers of the Church at different times as early as the second century, and there were now almost as many canons of "Inspired Gospels" as there were bishops to expound them. Finally, a council of the bishops was held for this purpose at Hippo in A. D. 393, at which no conclusion was reached. Great discussion arose and another council to consider this momentous subject was held at Carthage in 397, at which time the opinions of St. Augustine prevailed and the New Testament writings, substantially as we now have them, were decided to be canonical. At this distance from the time and scene of this great work we cannot and do not appreciate the delicacy, intricacy and importance of it. The more important books that were here voted out and classed as "non-canonical," and which were to be no more used as Scripture, were the following: "The Shepherd of Hermas," "The Gospel according to the Egyptians," "The Preach-

ing of Peter," "The Acts of Paul," several gospels under the name of "Matthew," and numerous epistles attributed to Barnabas, as well as many other gospels and writings. The minority body in these councils wanted to exclude from the canon certain of the books which the majority voted "canonical," and so we find that the New Testament scriptures were made up by many compromises and with much dissatisfaction among the theologians of that day.

It is difficult to ascertain whether Constantine embraced the Christian religion from a conviction of the truth and beauty of its teachings, or from motives of expediency. Eusebius tells us that Constantine, while with his army in Gaul, saw the form of the Cross in the sky with these words written upon it: "By this sign conquer." And Constantine is reported to have said that he saw Jesus, while in Gaul, with the Crown of Thorns on His head. Nazarius, who was with Constantine in Gaul, describes an army of "divine warriors who came down from the sky to assist Constantine," and refers to "the whole of the Gallic Nation for proof of this." Many other signs and wonders are said to have presented themselves to Constantine, all tending to influence him favorably toward Christianity. On the other hand, throughout Constantine's life, he retained the idolatrous proclivities of his youth and was inclined to worship the Sun. He sent offerings to the altar of Apollo, and published two conflicting decrees in

the same year:—one enjoining the observance of the Christian Sabbath, the other directing the regular consultation of the auspices. He also expressed the desire to proclaim himself a god and to demand divine honors of the people as the emperors before him had done. Constantine was not baptized until near his death; he had murdered his wife, son and nephew. He did not give Christians exclusive privileges. The decree of Milan, A. D. 313, recites: "We give to the Christians, and to all, the free choice to follow whatever mode of worship they may wish."

With the events of the fourth century, came a formal recognition of the honor due to the several churches that had been established by the apostles. Of these, the church at Rome was given first place "because it is the city of the kings." The others were Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth, and Constantinople, which latter was formerly Byzantium. Now the apostle Andrew is said to have established a church at Byzantium, or rather at the suburban town of Argyropolis, A. D. 36, and appointed as first bishop there his disciple, Stachis, whom Paul had "anointed with his own hands." The church had been served by eighteen successive bishops, when Constantine brought the seat of government to Constantinople, A. D. 313. Rome and the western churches used the Latin text and tongue, while Constantinople and the eastern churches used the Greek. Honors were about equally divided be-

tween the church at Rome and that at Constantinople when Emperor Justinian re-built, in the latter city, the magnificent church, St. Sophia, costing the equivalent of $70,000,000. The grandeur of this edifice was unsurpassed in that day. The exquisite and awe-inspiring beauty of its interior was said to be beyond the power of the words of man to describe. This enabled Justinian to say, when he entered it on the day of its consecration, "I have surpassed thee, O Solomon!" Domiciled in this temple, the eastern church seemed the more resplendent. The church at Rome had introduced certain innovations about this time, substituting unleavened for leavened bread, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and developing a "Purgatorium" or half-way place between earth and heaven or hell. It had also promulgated the doctrine of the "Infallibility of the Pope." The Greek, or orthodox, church thought these innovations scandalous and the Patriarch of the church at Constantinople wrote to the Pope at Rome condemning his action in introducing and promulgating these innovations. The Pope replied by demanding of the Patriarch to know by what right he questioned or condemned the conduct of the church at Rome, "whose actions can be judged by no mortal," and the Pope ended his letter by calling on the Patriarch to repent and beg forgiveness of his sin, "lest he be incorporated in the tail of the dragon who had swallowed up the third part of the orbs shining in the Heavens."

The Latin church was ambitious; the Greek conservative. A separation was inevitable and it was consummated in A. D. 1054. The Greek church regards herself as standing firm to all the traditions of the churches established by the apostles. She predominates, as the exponent of the Christian religion, over Western Asia, Northern Africa, and Russia; her ritual is unchanged from that established in the apostolic age; the Scriptures are still read in the Greek, and the head of the church is still at Constantinople, though the church does not now occupy nor possess the beautiful St. Sophia, for this superb temple is now a Moslem mosque and dedicated to the proposition that "God is God and Mohammed is His Prophet." The fortunes of the Latin or Roman church followed the new world; it carried the cross into the wilderness of central Europe and when the old order of the Gauls and Franks gave way to a new and better civilization, the church shared in the rich fruits of that opulent development. Later, following the ensign of Columbus to the new world of the West, it shared with Spain the spoils of conquest in both Americas. It suffered its most serious schism when the protests of Luther rang out over Europe and "Protestantism" was born at the diet of Spires in 1529.

II

CRITICISMS

Let us now go back to the first century and see how Christianity was regarded by its critics. In this effort we find a more difficult task, and reliable information neither abundant nor easily obtained. We have already shown that Rome thought only of the conquests of her legions and the plunder and spoils which conquests brought to her. She had no time for religion, nor inclination to philosophical studies or ethical speculation. It was quite otherwise with the Greeks. They had established schools of philosophy and had developed splendid systems, or modes, of thought and study. The Greek was an investigator and a real philosopher. The schools at Alexandria, at the beginning of the Christian era, have never been surpassed in fostering profound study of the universe and of man and his relation to the natural world. The universities of our age do not approach the schools of Alexandria in enthusiasm and ardor for real knowledge and scientific investigation. At the time Jesus was thirty years of age and beginning His ministry in Judea, Philo was forty years old and was a leader in all the philosophical studies of his day in the

schools at Alexandria. He was a Hellenic Jew of great liberality of mind and a thoroughly conscientious man. In religion he appropriated and developed the doctrine of the "Logos," conceived by Plato, and gave a Hellenic interpretation and coloring to the philosophy and religion of the Jews. Later, these conceptions greatly influenced the thought of the New Testament writers and the early Fathers of the Church, especially Origen, himself a Greek philosopher of Alexandria. Now this investigator, this philosopher, this contemporary of Jesus, this devout man, this well informed Hellenic Jew nowhere mentions Jesus, the apostles or the Christians. What are we to infer from this silence of one so likely to be among the first to know of Christianity and investigate its claims?

The celebrated Jewish historian, Justus, of the time of Jesus, does not allude to Jesus nor to His disciples nor to the Christians. The new sect was not known as "Christians," however, in Judea, at the time Justus lived and wrote. The historian and theologian Photius, A. D. 860, makes the following observation on the silence of Justus touching Jesus: "I have read the chronicle of Justus of Tiberius. He omits the greatest part of what was most necessary to be related; but as infected with Jewish prejudices, being himself a Jew by birth, he makes no mention at all of the advent, or of the acts done, or of the miracles wrought by Christ."

I purposely omit the harsh criticisms of Jesus

and of the early Christians found in the "Talmud" of the first century. The prejudices of the orthodox Jews were too strong at that time for reasonable or moderate criticism of Christianity and of its founder. There are two criticisms in the Talmud that may be referred to here; first, that with the Jews it was a crime for anyone to claim divine honors. Their conception of God was distinctively monotheistic. The Jews had no respect for the tendency of the age to pay divine honors to the emperors, nor for the polytheism of the Greeks. It was therefore with a degree of consistency that they counted Jesus a criminal in this, that he claimed divine honors of them. Second; that he deceived a credulous people by works of magic.

Seneca, born B. C. 4, grew to manhood contemporaneously with Jesus in the reign of Tiberius; was a philosopher of the Stoic school, a brilliant and a wealthy man; was one of the most eminent of the Latin writers of the first century; was consul in 57; and had been the teacher of Nero, finally committing suicide at the command of his imperial pupil. This man was a moralist. It has been said of him in this generation that he "anticipated all our best conceptions of morality." He was also an original investigator and went to the sources of things. He interrogated the mysteries of the heavens and of the physical world and questioned the meaning of life and the destiny of man. He sought to ascertain man's place in

nature and to make an adjustment between the aspirations of man and his environment. His elder brother, Gallio, was proconsul at Achaia, whither Paul had been haled before him by accusing Jews, and it is said of him "that he drave them from his judgment seat." Notwithstanding the many works of Seneca that are extant, and his high character and associations, he nowhere mentions Jesus, or the Christians. This fact was observed and felt by St. Jerome, who often extolled the virtues of Seneca.

There is a letter in the Apocryphal writings of the New Testament which purports to have been written by Seneca to the apostle Paul on the subject of the burning of Rome by the Christians, which report Nero circulated. This letter is believed by all critics to be spurious, and is thought to be the work of a zealous Christian, written to offset the charge which Nero had made, namely, that the Christians had started the conflagration. The letter follows.—

"Seneca to Paul of Tarsus:

"As to the frequent burnings of the city of Rome, the cause is manifest; and if a person in my mean circumstances might be allowed to speak, and one might declare these dark things without danger, every one should see the whole of the matter.

"The Christians and Jews are indeed commonly punished for the crime of burning the city; but that miscreant, who delights in murders and

butcheries, and disguises his villainies with lies, is appointed to, or reserved till, his proper time. Farewell."
"The 5th of the Calends of April,
in consulship of Frigius and Bassus."

The elder Pliny, a naturalist and an extensive writer, was ten years old when Jesus was crucified. He lived near Naples and perished in the eruption of Vesuvius A. D. 79. He is silent as to Jesus, the circumstances of His death and the work of His disciples. Writing on the subject of magic (BXXX, C2) Pliny says: "There is another sect, also, of adepts in the magic art, who derive their origin from Moses, Jannes, and Lotapea, Jews by birth, but many thousand years posterior to Zoroaster; (?) and as much more recent, again, is the branch of magic cultivated in Cyprus." To the last sentence the translators add this foot note: "By some it has been supposed that this bears reference to Christianity, as introduced into Cyprus by the apostle Barnabas. Owing to the miracles wrought in the infancy of the Church, the religion of the Christians was very generally looked upon as a sort of magic."

Josephus, born at Jerusalem in A. D. 38, some five or more years after the death of Jesus, a Jewish historian of much renown, mentions the execution of John the Baptist by Herod and states: "John was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to

come to baptism, for that the washing would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins, but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified before hand by righteousness. . . . Now when many others came in crowds about him, for they were greatly moved by hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion, for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise, thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man, who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to macherus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death. Now the Jews had an opinion that the destruction of Herod's army was sent as a punishment upon Herod and a mark of God's displeasure against him."

Josephus next refers to the death of the apostle James: "Festus was now dead, and Albinus was but upon the road; so Ananus assembled the Sanhedrin of Judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others; and when he had formed an accusation against them as breakers of the law, he delivered them to be stoned."

We have now to consider the reference to Jesus,

—the incidents of His life and His resurrection—which purports to have been written by Josephus. This reference has been held, by many scholars and critics, to be an interpolation. Edward Gibbon states in his history of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," that the paragraph in question is an interpolation and that it was not in the works of Josephus until after the council of Nicæa. Here is the disputed paragraph, in full: "Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call Him a man, for He was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure. He drew over to Him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was Christ; and when Pilate at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned Him to the cross, those that loved Him at the first did not forsake Him, for He appeared to them again on the third day, as the Divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning Him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from Him, are not extinct at this day." We know that Josephus paid "divine honors" to Vespasian while Vespasian was emperor and that he worshiped Vespasian after the Senate had decreed his apotheosis and had ordered a temple to be built to his honor and a priestly order established. If he believed that Jesus was Christ in the sense we understand the term, he was untrue to himself for he certainly did not pay "divine honors" to Jesus.

PROPERTY OF
MARGARET BARNETT WILLIAMS

That this reference to Jesus was not in the works of Josephus in the time of Origen, A. D. 185-254, may be safely inferred from the fact that Origen was familiar with the works of Josephus and of all the Jewish histories down to his time. Origen was learned in the Hebrew and had translated the Hebrew scriptures into Greek. When Origen attempted to answer the criticisms of Celsus against the Jews and the Scriptures, and against the Christians, he examined the works of Josephus carefully and employed and appropriated all that was applicable to this defense of the Jews and of the mission and teachings of Jesus. Had this paragraph been in the works of Josephus at that time, Origen would have brought it forth in his reply to Celsus, for this paragraph contains the particular statements which Origen was most in need of and which he nowhere found.

When one has read Origen's account of the death of James, taken from Josephus, it is difficult to believe that Origen wrote as one knowing of the paragraph in Josephus which relates to Jesus. "This James," says Origen, "was of so shining a character among the people, on account of his righteousness, that Flavius Josephus, when in his 20th book of the Jewish Antiquities, he had a mind to set down what was the cause why the people (Jews) suffered such miseries, till the very holy house was demolished, he said: 'these things befell them by the anger of God, on ac-

count of what they had dared to do to James, the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ;' and wonderful it is, that while he did not receive Jesus for Christ, he did nevertheless bear witness that James was so righteous a man." He says farther: "The people thought they had suffered these things for the sake of James." (Comment in Matt. Page 234, A. D. 230.)

An historian, writing to-day of the destruction of Jersualem and of the Jewish nation, would not attribute this calamity to the unjust execution of one of that nation's citizens by the Sanhedrin, but would, with more propriety and truth, attribute the overthrow of the Jews and Jerusalem to the fact that the Jews had rebelled against the imperial policy of Rome, had taken up arms and actually opposed and defeated the Roman garrison stationed in Judea at that time. It was due to these things, and not to the wrath of an avenging God, that Nero declared war on the Jews, and that Titus, under Vespasian, carried the war to a successful conclusion, destroyed the Jewish nation and demolished the ancient, and almost impregnable, city of Jerusalem, which had been established in the dim and distant past by Melchizedek and christened by him, "Salem."

We find much more on this important subject in Origen's exhaustive work: "Origen adversus Celsus"—book 1, pages 35-36, written about A. D. 250, viz: "I would say to Celsus, who personates a Jew, that admitted of John the Baptist,

and how he baptized Jesus, that one who lived a little while after John and Jesus wrote, how that John was a baptiser unto the Remission of Sins; for Josephus testifies, in the 18th book of his Jewish Antiquities, that John was the Baptist; and that he promised purification to those that were baptized. The same Josephus also, although he did not believe in Jesus as Christ, when he was inquiring after the cause of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the demolition of the temple, and ought to have said that their machinations against Jesus were the cause of those miseries coming on the people, because they had slain that Christ who was foretold by the prophets, he, though it were unwillingly, and yet as one not remote from the truth, says: 'These miseries befell the Jews by way of revenge for James the Just, who was the brother of Jesus that was called the Christ; because they had slain him who was a most righteous person.' Now this James was he whom that generous disciple of Jesus, Paul, said he had seen as the Lord's brother, which relation implies not so much nearness of blood, or the sameness of education, as it does the agreement of manners and preaching. If, therefore, he says the destruction of Jerusalem befell the Jews for the sake of James, with how much greater reason might he have said that it happened for the sake of Jesus."

In Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. Book 1, Chap. II), is an account of the martyrdom of James taken

from Josephus; we also find there the paragraph touching Jesus which we have been considering. This is the first notice we have of the much disputed paragraph. However, Eusebius does not put it in the same order, or place, in which it now appears in Josephus' works. Eusebius wrote this book about A. D. 330, five years after the council of Nicæa, and the inference is that this paragraph was interpolated in the work of Josephus shortly after the council referred to, for the purpose of supporting the doctrines affirmed by that council. A certain person, a presbyter of the Christian Church at Rome, named Caius, was charged with having made this interpolation, as we shall presently see. This theory has support in the fact that the Greek text of several of the gospels was changed at about this time and evidently for the same purpose. Even the apostle's creed was changed about this time, or a little later. The creed as we have it now, and as it has been written and used since the latter part of the fifth century, contains doctrine which is not found in the creed as originally written and used prior to the fifth century.

St. Ambrose, A. D. 360, quotes from Josephus, as Eusebius had done earlier, and then criticises the Jews in this manner: "If the Jews do not believe us, let them at least believe their own writers. Josephus, whom they esteem a very great man, hath said this, and yet hath he spoken

truth after such a manner; and so far was his mind wandered from the right way, that even he was not a believer as to what he himself said; but thus he spake, in order to deliver historical truth, because he thought it not lawful for him to deceive while yet he was no believer, because of the hardness of his heart and his perfidious intention. However, it was no prejudice to the truth that he was a disbeliever; but this adds more weight to his testimony that while he was an unbeliever, and unwilling this should be true, he has not denied it to be so."

Observe now how a later writer has misquoted, misunderstood or falsified Josephus: Johan Malela, Chronology, A. D. 850.—"From that time began the destruction of the Jews, as Josephus, the philosopher of the Jews, hath written; who also said this; 'that from the time the Jews crucified Christ, who was a good and righteous man, the land of Judea was never free from trouble.' These things the same Josephus, the Jew, has related in his writings."

From Photius, A. D. 860.—. . . "Josephus here speaks of the divinity of Christ, who is our true God, in a way very like to what we use, declaring that the same name of Christ belongs to Him and writes of His ineffable generation of the Father after such a manner as can not be blamed; which thing may perhaps raise a doubt in some, whether Josephus was the author of the work, though the phraseology does not at all differ

from this man's other works. However I have found in some papers, that this discourse was not written by Josephus, but by one Gaius, a presbyter."

It is important to know that this man was a bishop of the Eastern Church and resided at Constantinople. He was a Greek scholar of much erudition, but not familiar with the Latin tongue. Many critics are of the opinion that the presbyter, "Gaius," to whom Photius refers, is the same presbyter that Eusebius referred to under the name of "Caius."

Here follows an erroneous statement attributed to Josephus by Suidas, A. D. 980: "We have found Josephus, who hath written about the taking of Jerusalem, of which Eusebius makes frequent mention in his Ecclesiastical History, saying openly in his memoirs of the captivity, that Jesus officiated in the temple with the Priests; thus have we found Josephus saying, a man of ancient times, and not very long after the apostles."

The following statement by the writer, Theophylact, in Joan, A. D. 1080, misquotes Josephus: "The city of the Jews was taken and the wrath of God was kindled against them, as also Josephus witnesses, that this came upon them on account of the death of Jesus"!

It is worthy of mention here, that the early Greek theologian, Clement of Alexandria, writing A. D. 193-211, often refers to the works of Josephus, but never cites the paragraph which we are considering. Also the zealous and fiery

African bishop, Tertullian, A. D. 150-220, frequently refers to the writings of Josephus touching the Jews, but nowhere refers to this disputed paragraph relating to Jesus.

. . . . . .

Plutarch, born A. D. 65, teacher of Trajan and an historian of note, author of the incomparable and immortal "Lives," makes no reference to Jesus, to the apostles or to Christianity. This omission is painfully noticeable.

Epictetus, Stoic philosopher, A. D. 89, refers to the Christians casually in his "Ethical Discourse" as "Galilaei," or Galileans. He considered them a Jewish sect.

Next in order to be considered is Pliny the Younger, the accomplished scholar, consul under Trajan, born A. D. 60. We find him governor of Bithynia and writing to Trajan asking for instructions in prosecutions of Christians. From his most important letter on this subject is the following: "Having never been present at any trials concerning those who profess Christianity, I am unacquainted, not only with the nature of their crimes, or the measure of their punishment, but how far it is proper to enter into an examination concerning them. . . . I asked them whether they were Christians, if they admitted it, I repeated the question twice, and threatened them with punishment; if they persisted, I ordered them to be at once punished; for I was persuaded, whatever the nature of their opinions might be,

a contumacious and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved correction. . . . There were others also brought before me possessed with the same infatuation, but being Roman citizens, I directed them to be sent to Rome." He then goes on to say: "They affirmed the whole of their guilt, or their error, was that they met on a stated day before it was light, and addressed a form of prayer to Christ, as to a divinity, binding themselves by solemn oath, not for the purposes of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust. . . . Then to eat in common a harmless meal. . . . To this I forbade the meeting of any assemblies. . . . After receiving this account I judged it so much the more necessary to endeavor to extort the real truth by putting two female slaves to torture. . . . But all I could discover was evidence of an absurd and extravagant superstition. . . . I deemed it therefore expedient to adjourn all further proceedings in order to consult you. . . . This contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only but has spread its infection among the neighboring villages and country." These excerpts show the object and meaning of this letter.

The emperor's reply.—

"Trajan to Pliny:

"You have adopted the right course, my dearest Secundus, in investigating the charges against

the Christians who were brought before you. It is not possible to lay down any general rule for all such cases. Do not go out of your way to look for them. If indeed they should be brought before you, and the crime is proved, they must be punished; with the restriction, however, that where the party denies he is a Christian, and shall make it evident that he is not, by invoking our gods, let him be pardoned upon his repentance. Anonymous information ought not to be received in any sort of prosecution. It is introducing a very dangerous precedent, and is quite foreign to the spirit of our age."

These letters were written in the first year, or close thereto, of the second century, sixty-nine years after the crucifixion of Jesus, and they show clearly that the well-informed people and governors of Rome did not know what Christianity was, and that the doctrines of Christians were generally thought to be those of a sect of the Jews and consequently unimportant. It is interesting to read another letter from Pliny to Trajan and Trajan's reply, for they disclose the state of mind of those eminent men touching public worship.—

"Pliny to Trajan:

"We have celebrated, Sir, with great joy and festivity, those votive solemnities which were publicly proclaimed as formerly, and renewed them the present year, accompanied by the soldiers and

provincials, who zealously joined with us in imploring the gods that they would be graciously pleased to preserve you and the Republic in that state of prosperity which your many and great virtues, particularly your piety and reverence towards them, so justly merit."

"Trajan to Pliny:

"It was agreeable to me to learn by your letter that the army and the provincials seconded you, with the most joyful unanimity, in those vows which you paid and renewed to the immortal gods for my preservation and prosperity."

We now turn to the historian TACITUS, an able and conscientious recorder of events, born A. D. 65. Referring to a number of illustrious citizens who had suffered banishment, or ostracism, in the reign of Claudius, but who, under the consulship of Nero and Piso, had been restored to their former rank, Tacitus proceeds to say: "And Pomponia Græcina, a lady of distinction, charged with embracing a foreign superstition, and married to Plautius, who upon his return from Britain entered the city in ovation, was consigned to the abjudication of her husband. Plautius assembled her kindred, and in observance of primitive institution, having in their presence held solemn inquisition upon the conduct and character of his wife, adjudged her innocent." Referring to this incident, Justin Lipsius, a translator of Tacitus, says that the "foreign

superstition" here referred to was primitive Christianity. This was about the time, or a little earlier, Paul gave the name "Christian" to his followers at Antioch.

In his "Annals" Tacitus gives an account of the burning of Rome by Nero, and shows how Nero sought to put the blame of it on the Christians. He also gives an account of the Christians: "But not all the relief that could come from man; not all the bounties that the Prince could bestow; nor all the atonements that could be presented to the gods, availed to relieve Nero from the infamy of being believed to have ordered the conflagration. Hence to suppress the rumor, he falsely charged with guilt, and punished with the most exquisite tortures, the persons commonly called Christians, who were hated for their enormities. Christus, the founder of that name, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, in the reign of Tiberius, but the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again, not only through Judea, where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also, whither all things horrible and disgraceful flow, from all quarters, as to a common receptacle, and where they are encouraged. Accordingly, first those were seized who confessed they were Christians; next on their information, a vast multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of burning the city, as of hating the human race. And in their deaths they were also

made the subjects of sport, for they were covered with the hides of wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set fire to, and when day declined, burned to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero offered his own gardens for that spectacle and exhibited a circensian game, indiscriminately mingling with the common people in the habit of a charioteer, or else standing in his chariot. Whence a feeling of compassion arose toward the sufferers, though guilty and deserving to be made examples of by capital punishment, because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but victims to the ferocity of one man." This historian, like all others of the first century, does not distinguish the Christians as such from the Jews, but regards them a sect of the Jews, and at that time all Rome hated the Jews. The "Christus" referred to here is Christ.

Contemporaneous with Tacitus and Pliny, JUVENAL lived and wrote his justly famous "Satires." Juvenal was a good man. He taught us morality by antithesis; belonged to no school of positive ethics, yet ever declaimed against the immorality of his age, and vigorously satirized the bad. He was not of Consular rank, as were his two more brilliant contemporaries, but was of the middle class, with parentage still lower. In sympathy and in environment he was nearer to the Christians of his day than any other scholar of the first and second centuries. His writing of the "Satires" was synchronous with the

writing of the fourth gospel by its author or authors. We would naturally expect something of Juvenal touching "Christus" and His disciples, but he gives us not a word. In his first "Satire," wherein he recounts the crimes of Nero, Juvenal refers to the sufferings of the Christians following the burning of Rome, though he does not call them "Christians" nor does he indicate whether those persecuted were Jews or Gentiles. He says:

With those, some night, thou shalt be called to shine,
Who writhe in tortures mid the blazing pine,
With throats transfixed all smoking as they stand,
And raise deep furrows in the fatal sand.

Juvenal gives ten lines in his XIV Satire in which to express, in a truly characteristic manner, his opinion of the orthodox "Jewish superstition." The same general opinion is voiced by many Roman authors of the first and second centuries. Juvenal says:

There be, who, bred in sabbath-fearing lore,
The vague divinity of clouds adore;
Who, like their sires, their skin to priests resign,
And hate like human flesh the flesh of swine.
The laws of Rome those blinded bigots slight,
In superstitious dread of Jewish rite:
To Moses and his mystic volume true,
They set no traveller right except a Jew!
By them no cooling spring was ever shown,
Save to the thirsty circumcised alone!

Martial, another writer of satire, who lived

and wrote at this time, mentions this incident: A special tax had been levied on the Jews of Palestine in the reign of Domitian. The Christians asked exemption; the Procurator inquired of them:—"Are ye not circumcised?" "Yes," replied the Christians. "Then ye are Jews and must pay the tax."

In the works of Justinus, fourth century, A. D., there is printed a letter from a "Gentile" to Diognetus, preceptor to Marcus Aurelius, in which the writer inquires: "What is the religion of the Christians? What god do they worship? Why is it that their religion makes them despise the world, death and the gods of the Greeks? If Jewish why do they oppose the Jewish superstition? What is it that makes them love one another and why is it that this religion is introduced now and not before?" These questions from an unknown "Gentile" of A. D. 140, are interesting enough.

Suetonius, A. D. 70, historian and friend of the younger Pliny, was secretary to Emperor Hadrian. He regarded the Christians a sect of the Jews, and speaks of them as "a class of men with a strange and pestilent superstition." It is safe for us to assume that in this statement Suetonius reflects the opinion held by the emperor and the governing class. It is remarkable that this historian "of the Cæsars" has but a word to say of the Christians.

Domitian sentenced to death his nephew,

Flavius Clemens, a Christian of Consular rank. He was executed, along with a number of Christians, in A. D. 90. The sentence recites that these were "guilty of atheism and Jewish manners." To proselyte to Judaism was a crime punishable by death or forfeiture of property discretionary with the pro-consuls. Atheism in Rome, at that time, was disbelief in the gods, but the informative part of this sentence is, that in the reign of Domitian, Christianity was held to be a Jewish institution.

Lucian, a rhetorician and writer of real literary merit, comes to us fresh from far off Syria, for he was born at Samosata on the Euphrates. He was a Greek scholar and familiar with all the schools of Greek philosophy. He was born about A. D. 140, and was a real iconoclast, for he employed the severest sarcasm in writing of the gods of the Greeks and opposed with ridicule as well the doctrines of the Greek schools. With a bold imagination he surpassed Jules Verne in originality of creation and description. He assumed at the outset in life that "anyone will be looked up to and get a reputation if only he has impudence and abuse." Putting this assumption into practice, he won an imperishable name as a writer of satire, and claimed that "men's actions always fall short of their professions." He studied the several schools of philosophy, "for each claimed to embody the best system of morals and to rest on truth itself," and found that, "each school was antagonistic to the others;"

therefore he claimed that truth was a relative term only. Late in life, he held a lucrative office, in Egypt, which he mentioned thus: "I lent my neck to be bound by a golden collar." Paraphrasing Lucian, the attitude of the philosophers of his time is of interest: Representatives of the different schools of philosophy had met to dine together for "sweet discourse;" whereupon they disagreed on the question of "exact truth;" following which they pulled one another's beards, and spit in one another's faces; then they proceeded to knock the table over and throw the dishes at one another, and finally disbanded in a free-for-all fight; Lucian thereupon concludes that there is no such thing as "truth." Now that we know the bent of Lucian's mind, and the character of his thoughts, his humor, and his misanthropy, let us note his expressions touching Jesus and the Christians. In a letter addressed, —"Lucian to Cronius," in which Lucian describes the death of Proteus, he says: "It was now that he came across the priests and scribes of the Christians, in Palestine, and picked up their queer creed. I can tell you, he soon convinced them of his superiority; prophet, elder, ruler of the synagogue, he was everything at once; expounded their books, commented on them, wrote books himself. They took him for a god, accepted his laws, and declared him their president. The Christians, you know, worship a man to this day,—the distinguished personage who introduced

their novel rites, and was crucified on that account. Well! the end of it was that Proteus was arrested and thrown into prison. This was the very thing to lend an air to his favorite arts of clap-trap and wonder-working; he was now a made man. The Christians took it all very seriously; he was no sooner in prison, than they began trying every means to get him out again, but without success. Everything else that could be done for him they most devoutly did. They thought of nothing else. Orphans and ancient widows might be seen hanging about the prison from break of day. Their officials bribed the gaolers to let them sleep inside with him. Elegant dinners were conveyed in; their sacred writings were read; and our old friend Proteus became for them 'the modern Socrates.' In some of the Asiatic cities, too, the Christian communities put themselves to the expense of sending deputations, with offers of sympathy, assistance, and legal advice. The activity of these people in dealing with any matter that affects their community, is something extraordinary; they spare no trouble, no expense. Proteus, all this time, was making quite an income on the strength of his bondage; money came pouring in. You see, these misguided creatures start with the general conviction that they are immortal for all time, which explains the contempt of death and voluntary self-devotion which are so common among them; and then it was impressed on them by their

original lawgiver that they are all brothers, from the moment that they are converted, and deny the gods of Greece, and worship the crucified Sage, and live after his laws. All this they take quite on trust, with the result that they despise all worldly goods alike, regarding them merely as common property. Now an adroit, unscrupulous fellow, who has seen the world, has only to get among these simple souls, and his fortune is made; he plays with them."

Lucian also refers to the doctrine of the trinity and to the apostle Paul; "The Galilean who ascended to the third heaven and was renewed by the waters of baptism."

The Emperor Aurelius, A. D. 121-180, in his ethical work, the "Meditations," refers to the Christians but once and that disparagingly, mentioning their "obstinacy" and fondness for martyrdom or "tragic show." He says: "What a soul that is which is ready, if at any moment it must be separated from the body, and ready either to be extinguished, or dispersed, or continue to exist; but so that this readiness comes from a man's own judgment, not from mere obstinacy, as with the Christians, but considerately and with dignity and in a way to persuade another, without tragic show."

Hierocles, proconsul at Bithynia, A. D. 284, wrote a book addressed to the Christians in which he affirmed that their "sacred writings contained contradictions" and that in "moral influence and

miraculous power Jesus of Nazareth was inferior to Apollonius of Tyana." This work is lost and we know of it only by the replies to it made later by Eusebius and Lactantius.

CELSUS

Celsus, a Greek and of the Epicurean school, was born about A. D. 180. He wrote the most profuse criticism of the Christian religion of any of the early authors. His work, titled: "A True Discourse," comprised over two hundred propositions and covered the subject of biblical criticism from Moses down to his time. His treatise is lost and we know of it only from what appears in the work of Origen, titled, "Origen adversus Celsus." On the whole, Celsus was a coarse and prejudiced critic and we feel instinctively repulsed from him and drawn towards the more accomplished scholar and philosopher, Origen.

It is impossible to extendedly consider here the criticisms of Celsus. It required six hundred pages of fine print for Origen to reply to those criticisms. The most interesting feature of this work by Origen, and of the writings of the pre-Nicene theologians generally, is the state of mind which these writings disclose. While those men were clear and deep thinkers, the fact remains that their minds were hot beds of superstition and incapable of judging and correctly classifying many of the ordinary phenomena of life. Their hearts were right, but the angle of their vision

was distorted, their perspective perverted and their premises false.

Origen, the greatest theologian of his day, born at Alexandria, A. D. 185, was familiar with every school of philosophy and well versed in all the history of his time. He was an ascetic and a self-emasculated eunuch. I shall notice but a few criticisms, compared with the whole work, and deal with them briefly.

Touching the prophecies, the discussion shows that the one prophesied of was not proclaimed by the prophets as the "Son of God," but as "Immanuel," and other similar names. This may seem to descend to the level of casuistry, but it is something more than a "distinction without a difference," for it enabled the orthodox Jew to say to the Christian Jew, "Our prophecies nowhere mention the coming of a 'Son of God.'"

It is charged that the Christians brought down upon themselves the disfavor of the Roman magistrates because they persisted in holding secret meetings in violation of the laws. This was admitted by Origen and justified. But let us note the accusations and the answers. My comment will follow the latter.

Celsus: "Immoralities were practiced in these secret meetings."

Origen: "We deny this."

This can be admitted only in exceptional cases. Tertullian, when he left the Catholic body and

joined the "Montanist" body of Christians, states several instances of this kind. I know of no other testimony from a Christian source. I have examined this charge with care. I have before me the criticism of Tertullian, made after he had left the Catholic body, which is briefly this: that the churches were crowded with people of all rank. Many who had been criminals came to the altars for forgiveness of sins, "whom the temples and the gods of Rome would not absolve." And these mixed multitudes put in danger many of the institutions, or rites of the Church; especially the rite of the "Agapae," or love feast, in which the indiscriminate and unreserved kiss was indulged. This was more than human nature, and the "Mediterranean climate" could stand, and scandal and even tragedies followed, and cases of more immoral practices are specifically mentioned.[5] But Tertullian conveys the idea that the irregular lives within the Church were the exception and that the majority were good people.

Celsus: "Christians imitate the polytheists in establishing chambers of mysteries in their churches with pass words and degrees, and rites of initiation."

Origen: "We deny this."

[5] "Sed majoris est agape, quia per hanc adolescentes tui cum sororibus dormiunt appendices scilicet gulae lascivia et luxuria."

To this we have but one instance that I am aware of and that by the "Valentinians," a Christian body of some importance. The Valentinians divided their church, or societies, into chambers, degrees and orders, and the votary was initiated into these orders by a solemn ceremony. The first service appears to have been open to all classes, after this service was held, and before the "initiated" resolved themselves into a second meeting, a deacon would step to the door, then turn around facing the audience, and in a loud voice, after the manner of a bailiff calling court to order, would say: "Come out all ye catechumen, all ye who are possessed and who are uninitiated."

CELSUS: "It is by the name of certain demons and the use of incantation that Christians manifest miraculous power."

ORIGEN: "It is by the name of Jesus that demons have been and are driven from men."

CELSUS: "Faith is not the quality of mind which men should choose to govern action and determine propositions but rather reason and judgment."

ORIGEN: "It is by faith that men take a voyage, that they sow seed in the Spring and finally it is by faith that a man takes a wife."

This last proposition is certainly doubtful and I reserve it, as Aristotle would say, for "separate consideration."

CELSUS: "The star and the wise men who followed it to the cradle of Jesus were not generally seen by the people of Bethlehem, and that this story, for several reasons given, must be false."

ORIGEN: (*In part*) "It has been observed that, on the occasion of great events, and of mighty changes in terrestrial things, such stars are wont to appear, indicating either the removal of dynasties or the breaking out of wars, or the happening of such circumstances as may cause commotion upon the earth. . . . If, then, at the commencement of new dynasties, or on occasion of other important events, there arise a comet, or any similar celestial body, why should it be a matter of wonder that at the birth of Him who was to introduce a new doctrine to the human race and to make known His teachings not only to Jews but also to Greeks and to many of the barbarous nations besides, a star should have arisen?"

CELSUS: (Characterizing Christian miracle workers as "Jugglers" proceeds) "Are they not like unto those who were taught by the Egyptians, who, in the market places, in return for a few obols, will impart the knowledge of their most venerated arts, and will expel demons from men, and dispel diseases, and invoke the souls of heroes, and exhibit expensive banquets, and tables, and dishes,

and dainties, having no real existence, and who will put in motion, as if alive, what are not living animals but which have only the appearance of life; and now since these men can perform such wonderful feats, shall we of necessity conclude that they are Sons of God?"

ORIGEN: (Not denying but asserting for Christians greater and more wonderful works) "The name of Jesus can still remove distractions from the minds of men and expel demons and take away diseases and produce a marvelous meekness of spirit and a complete change of character, and give assurance of, concerning God and Christ and a judgment to come."

It appears that Christians and "Jugglers" alike, could cast out demons in those days with the ease that a physician can to-day, "for a few obols," cast out worms from a child with a dose of vermifuge.

Touching the sublime questions of "fore-ordination" and "predestination," this interesting bit of Greek logic is introduced: "If it is decreed that you should recover from your disease, you will recover, whether you call in a physician or not; but if it is decreed that you should not recover, you will not recover whether you call in a physician or no. But it is certainly decreed either you should recover, or that you should not

recover; therefore it is vain that you call in a physician."

CELSUS: (Complaining that his discourses with theologians were met only with the injunction, 'Believe,' 'Believe,' Celsus states forcefully) "A Greek must be convinced of the truth of a proposition before he can believe it and faith can only follow understanding." (Celsus also charges) "The Church assemblies do not compare favorably with those at the temples and with civil bodies."

ORIGEN: (Denying this, Origin makes comparisons of the churches of Corinth, Alexandria and Athens) "For the church at Athens is a meek and stable body, as being one which desires to please God, who is over all things, whereas the assembly of Athens is given to sedition and is not at all to be compared to the church of that city."

In the discussion of Gehenna, Tartarus and other hot places, Origen manifests some deception and withholds the insignificant meaning of Gehenna, lest it might diminish the fear of hell among men; "But," says he of Gehenna, "the remarks which might be made on this topic are neither to be made to all, nor to be uttered on the present occasion; for it is not unattended with danger to commit to writing the explanation of such subjects, seeing the multitude need no further

instruction than that which relates to the punishment of sinners, for to ascend beyond this is not expedient, for sake of those who are with difficulty restrained even by fear of eternal punishment."

CELSUS: (Claiming that the ethical thoughts contained in the gospels were taken from the Greek schools, refers especially to this one) "Whosoever shall strike thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also" (and he gives its parallel from Plato).

SOCRATES: "Must we never do injustice to any?"

CRITO: "Certainly not."

SOCRATES: "And since we must never do injustice, must we not return an injustice for an injustice that has been done to us, as most people think?"

CRITO: "It seems to me that we should not."

SOCRATES: "But tell me, Crito, may we do evil to anyone or not?"

CRITO: "Certainly not."

SOCRATES: "Well is it just, as it is commonly said, for one who has suffered wrong, to do wrong in return, or is it unjust?"

CRITO: "It is unjust."

SOCRATES: "Yes, for to do harm to a man is the same as to do him injustice."

CELSUS: (Then Celsus undertakes to show that if Christians worshiped one God alone, rather than three, they might with more

propriety oppose the polytheism of the Greeks and inquires) "If the Romans will close their temples and disband their legions and worship the Christians' 'God of Hosts' will He assist them in their imperial policy of governing the world?"

ORIGEN: "He will."

CELSUS: "How is it then that the Jews, after having followed Jehovah for centuries are now without so much as a patch of ground?"

ORIGEN: "Because of the treatment the Jews have given to their prophets and to Jesus."

CELSUS: "Jesus was not a god because His life, His form and His voice were not consistent with, or agreeable to, our ideas of a god. He did not come up to the average of men in the qualities we ascribe to a god."

ORIGEN: "These are indeed trifling and altogether contemptible objections. For our reply to him will be, that he who is believed among the Greeks to be a god, viz., the Pythian and Didymean Apollo, makes use of such a voice for his Pythian priestess at Delphi, and for his prophetess at Miletus; and yet neither the Pythian nor Didymean is charged by the Greeks with not being a god."

CELSUS: "How shall we deem Him to be God, who, not only in other respects, as was currently reported, performed none of His promises, but who, also, after we had convicted Him, and condemned Him as deserving of punish-

ment, was found attempting to conceal Himself, and endeavoring to escape in a most disgraceful manner, and who was betrayed by those whom He called disciples? And yet He who was a God could neither flee nor be led away a prisoner; and least of all could He be deserted and delivered up by those who had been His associates, and had shared all things in common, and had had Him for their teacher, who was deemed to be a Savior, and a Son of the greatest God, and an Angel."

ORIGEN: "To which we reply, that even we do not suppose the body of Jesus, which was then an object of sight and perception, to have been God. And why do I say His body? Nay, not even His soul, of which it is related,—'My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death.' But as according to the Jewish manner of speaking,—'I am the Lord, the God of all flesh,' and, 'Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.' God is believed to be He who employs the soul and body of the prophet as an instrument; and as, according to the Greeks, He who says; 'I know both the number of the sands, and the measures of the sea, and I understand a dumb man, and hear him who does not speak,' is considered to be a god when speaking, and making himself heard through the Pythian priestess; so, accord-

ing to our view, it was the Logos God, and Son of the God of all things, who spake in Jesus these words:—'I am the way and the truth, and the life'; and these,—'I am the door'; and these: 'I am the living bread that came down from Heaven'; and other expressions similar to these. We therefore charge the Jews with not acknowledging Him to be God, to whom testimony was borne in many passages by prophets, to the effect that He was a mighty power, and a God next to the God and Father of all things. For we assert that it was to Him the Father gave the command, when in the Mosaic account of the creation He uttered the words, 'Let there be light,' and 'Let there be a firmament,' and gave the injunction with regard to those other creative acts which were performed; and that to Him also were addressed the words: 'Let us make man in our own image and likeness,' and that the Logos, when commanded, obeyed all the Father's will, and we make these statements not from our own conjectures, but because we believe the prophecies circulated among the Jews, in which it is said of God, and of the works of creation, in express words, as follows: 'He spake, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created.' Now if God gave the command, and the creatures were formed, who, according to the view of the spirit of

prophecy, could He be that was able to carry out such commands of the Father, save Him who, so to speak, is the living Logos and the Truth? And that the Gospels do not consider Him who in Jesus said these words: 'I am the way, and the Truth and the Life,' to have been of so circumscribed a nature, as to have an existence nowhere out of the soul and body of Jesus, is evident both from many considerations, and from a few instances of the following kind which we shall quote. John the Baptist, when predicting that the Son of God was to appear immediately, not in that body and soul, but as manifesting himself everywhere, says regarding Him: 'There stands in the midst of you one whom ye know not, who cometh after me.' For if he had thought that the Son of God, was only there, where was the visible body of Jesus, how could he have said: 'There stands in the midst of you one whom ye know not?' and Jesus himself, in raising the minds of His disciples to higher thoughts of the Son of God, says: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of you.' And of the same nature is this promise to His disciples; 'Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.' And we quote these passages, making no distinction between the Son of God and Jesus. For the soul and body of Jesus formed one

being with the Logos of God. Now if according to Paul's teaching, 'He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit,' every one who understands what being joined to the Lord is, and who has been actually joined to Him, is one spirit with the Lord; how should not that being be one in a far greater and more divine degree which was once united with the Logos of God? He indeed manifested Himself among the Jews as the power of God, by the miracles He performed, which Celsus suspected were accomplished by sorcery, but which the Jews attributed to Beelzebub."

Here is a most interesting bit of theology from the most eminent theologian of the second century; this was written one hundred years before the Nicene council defined Christian doctrine.

CELSUS: (Writing against the possibility of a resurrection of a dead body and referring to Jesus, Celsus asks) "How can the dead man be immortal?"

ORIGEN: "Since the resurrection of Jesus Christ is a subject of mockery to unbelievers, we shall quote the words of Plato that Herus, the son of Armenius, rose from the funeral pile twelve days after he had been laid upon it, and gave an account of what he had seen in Hades; and as we are replying to unbelievers it will not be amiss to refer in this

place to what Heraclides relates respecting the woman who was deprived of life.[6] And many persons are recorded to have risen from their tombs, not only on the day of their burial, but also on the day following. What wonder is it, then, if in the case of one who performed many marvelous things, both beyond the power of man and with such fullness of evidence, that he who could not deny their performance, endeavored to calumniate them by comparing them to acts of sorcery, should have manifested also in His death some greater display of divine power, so that His soul, if it pleased, might leave its body, and having performed certain offices out of it, might return again at pleasure? Such a declaration is Jesus said to have made in the Gospel of John, when He said: 'No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again.' . . . Let him who wishes to understand know, that it is not the dead man who is immortal, but He who rose from the dead."

When we examine the history of civilized man at the point where mythology gives way to authentic narrative, where tradition emerges from the gloom of uncertainty and superstition, we find many accounts of "resurrections" of the dead sim-

[6] Plin. Nat. Hist. Book VII, c52.

ilar to the two instances cited in the foregoing paragraph.

Origen might have mentioned the circumstance of Aristeas of Proconnesus who rose twice from death if we may believe tradition, and who was worshiped by a considerable following.

Apuleius, a gifted author and a contemporary of Origen, relates an incident in his work, "The Florida" which is interesting, more particularly from the circumstances attendant upon it. The dead man had been an important personage, the obsequies were imposing and partook of the character of a public spectacle. The funeral pyre had been built unusually high and the environment and accessories were all impressive. The torch had been applied and the assembled multitude stood uncovered and silent, when it was observed that the corpse was coming to life. A physician rushed upon the burning pyre and snatched the body from the flames. The man revived. The crowd now murmured and became angry that the spectacle had been interrupted; the man's relatives were apologetic. Apuleius closes the narrative thus: "The assembly and even the relatives protested but finally yielded. They claimed, and with some apparent justice, that the corpse had no right to interrupt the ceremony and withdraw from the care of the undertakers and turn back from his journey to the Infernal Regions."

I am surprised that Origen refers to instances

of this character in connection with the resurrection of Jesus. A physician to-day would pronounce all such cases "suspended animation," and class them under the science of pathology. No one would to-day attribute them to a miraculous cause. No one to-day believes with Herod: "That John whom I have beheaded hath risen from the dead."

CELSUS: (Criticising the account of the resurrection of Jesus, Celsus says) "If He was a God he should have manifested His powers openly that He might have been known to have been a God universally."

ORIGEN: . . . "So none could reasonably object to the statement of the Apostles, who introduce the appearance of Jesus after His resurrection as having been made, not to all, but to those only whom He knew to have received eyes capable of seeing His resurrection."

This suggests that the attitude of the percipient is to be considered in connection with the circumstances of the resurrection;—that the phenomenon was subjective rather than objective.

CELSUS: (Referring to an axiom then current relating to Christian beliefs, Celsus states) "Such is the power of faith because it seizes that which first presents itself that with the Christians, it having taken possession of their minds, makes them yield the assent which they

give to the doctrines of Jesus. . . . *Faith is the power of saying you believe in things which are incredible.*"

ORIGEN: "We have salvation through faith."

CELSUS: "It is not without piety, but none the less with error, that the Christians regard this mortal Jesus a God."

ORIGEN: "Let those who make this charge understand that He whom we regard and believe to have been from the beginning God, and the Son of God, is the Very Logos, and the Very Wisdom, and the Very Truth; and with respect to His mortal body, and the human soul which it contained, we assert that not by their communion merely with Him but by their unity and intermixture, they receive the highest powers and after participating in His divinity, were changed into God."

CELSUS: "Granting that after Jesus had lived and suffered as others live and suffer, and that after having laid aside these qualities He became a God; in what does He excel Aesculapius, Dionysus and Hercules?"

ORIGIN: "What great deeds have Aesculapius, Dionysus and Hercules wrought? And what individuals will they be able to point out as having been improved in character and made better by their words and lives, so that they may make good their claims to be gods?"

This is well stated by Origen. These divinities,

while purporting to serve mankind in profitable labors, yet never proclaimed as pure a morality as that found in the Lord's Prayer or in His Sermon on the Mount. The truths of mathematics are eternal and unchangeable, and moral principles too are immortal,—crucify and bury them and they will rise again.

CELSUS: "When the initiators into the Grecian mysteries invite to a participation of their mysteries at the temples, they make proclamation as follows: 'Every one who has clean hands and a prudent tongue, let him come. He who is pure from all pollution, and whose soul is conscious of no evil, and who has lived well and justly—let him come.' Now let us hear what kind of persons these Christians invite? Every one, they say, who is a sinner, who is devoid of understanding, who is a child, and, to speak generally, whoever is unfortunate, him will the Kingdom of God receive. Do you not call him a sinner, then, who is unjust, and a thief, and a housebreaker, and a poisoner, and a committer of sacrilege and a robber of the dead? What others would a man invite if he were issuing a proclamation for an assembly of robbers?"

ORIGEN: "We invite all men to be healed, and exhort those who are sinners to come to a consideration of the doctrines which teach men not to sin, and to those who are void of under-

standing to come to those who beget wisdom, and to those who are children to rise in their thoughts to manhood, and those who are unfortunate, to good fortune, or rather to blessedness, and when those who have been turned towards virtue have made progress, and have shown that they have been purified by the Word, and have led as far as they can a better life, then and not before do we invite them to participate in our mysteries."

ORIGEN: (Writing of Serapis and his newly instituted worship, Origen conveys the idea that he is not venerable and by contrast says) "For the Son of God, the first-born of all creation, although he seemed recently to have become incarnate, is not by any means on that account recent, for the Holy Scriptures know Him to be the most ancient of all the works of creation; for it was to Him that God said regarding the creation of man,—'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.'"

CELSUS: (Showing that Plato would have been glad to reach all men and help them if he could have made himself understood to all, Celsus quotes him from the "Greatest Good") "If it appeared to me that these matters could be adequately explained to the multitude in writing and in oral address, what nobler pursuit in life could have been followed by me, than to commit to writing what

was to prove of such advantage to human beings, and to lead the nature of all men onwards to the light?"

ORIGEN: "Let those who wish to, consider whether Plato was acquainted with any doctrines more profound or more divine than those which he has left behind him, while we demonstrate that our prophets did know of greater things than any in the Scriptures, but which they did not commit to writing. Ezekiel received a roll written within and without, in which were contained, 'Lamentations,' and 'Songs,' and 'Denunciations'; but at the command of the Logos he swallowed the book, in order that its contents might not be written and so made known to unworthy persons. John also is recorded to have seen and done a similar thing, and again while teaching us the difference between what ought to be committed to writing and what not, declares that he heard seven thunders instructing him on certain matters, and forbidding him to commit their words to writing. Nay, Paul even heard, 'Unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter.' And it is related of Jesus, who was greater than all these, that he conversed with His disciples in private, and especially in their secret retreats, concerning the Gospel of God; but the words which He uttered have not been preserved,

because it appeared to the evangelists that they could not be adequately conveyed to the multitude in writing or in speech. And if it were not tiresome to repeat the truth regarding these illustrious individuals, I would say that they saw better than Plato what things were to be committed to writing, and how this was to be done, and what was by no means to be written to the multitude, and what was to be expressed in words, and what was not to be so conveyed."

It is painful to observe the weakness and the superstition manifested in Origen's reply. An apologist, of his learning, and one so greatly venerated, should have found better arguments or have ignored the subject entirely.

CELSUS: "The comic poets, to cause laughter in the theater, wrote that, 'Jupiter, after awakening from a long sleep, dispatched Mercury, to his proteges,—the contentious and irascible Athenians and Lacedæmonians'; but do you not think that the Christians have made the Son of God more ridiculous in sending Him to the Jews?"

ORIGEN: "We stated, indeed, in what precedes, that it was not as if awakening from a lengthened slumber that God sent Jesus to the human race, who has now, for good reasons, fulfilled the economy of His incarnation, but who has always conferred benefits

upon the human race. For no noble deed has ever been performed amongst men, where the Divine Word did not visit the souls of those who were capable, although for a little time, of admitting such operations of the Divine Word. Moreover, the advent of Jesus, apparently to one corner of the earth, was founded on good reasons, since it was necessary that He who was the subject of prophecy should make His appearance among those who had become acquainted with the doctrine of one God, and who perused the writings of His prophets, and who had come to know the announcement of Christ, and that He should come to them at a time when the Word was about to be diffused from one corner over the whole world. . . . And we do not admit that a fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies was had, as urged by Josephus and Tacitus, in the elevation of Vespasian to the throne of Rome."

There is no doubt that Josephus paid divine honors to Vespasian, and that he professed to believe that the coming of Vespasian from Judea to the throne of Rome was a fulfillment of the prophecies, I quote at length Tacitus on the subject to which Origen refers: "Such prodigies had happened, as this nation (The Jews), which is superstitious enough in its own way, would not agree to expiate by the ceremonies of the Roman

religion, nor would they atone the gods by sacrifices and vows, as these used to do on the like occasions. Armies were seen to fight in the sky, and their armour appeared of a bright light color, and the temple shone with sudden flashes of fire out of the clouds. The doors of the temple were opened on a sudden, and a voice greater than human was heard, that the gods were retiring, and at the same time there was a great motion perceived, as if they were going out of it, which some esteemed to be causes of terror. The greater part had a firm belief that it was contained in the old Sacerdotal books, that at this very time the East would prevail, and that some that came out of Judea should obtain the Empire of the world, which obscure oracle foretold Vespasian and Titus; but the generality of the common people, as usual, indulged their own inclinations, and when they had once interpreted all to forbode grandeur to themselves, adversity itself could not persuade them to change their minds, though it were from falsehood to truth."

Celsus: (Quoting at length from the Mosaic law and from the prophets showing that the laws of Moses came from God, or had His approval, Celsus then says) "While on the other hand His son, the man of Nazareth, promulgated laws quite opposite to these, declaring that no one can come to the Father who loves power, or riches, or glory; that

men ought not to be more careful to provide food than the ravens; that they were to be less concerned about their raiment than the lilies, that to him who has given them one blow, they should offer to receive another. Whether is it Moses or Jesus that teaches falsely? Did the Father when He sent Jesus forget the command which He had given to Moses? Or did He change His mind, condemn His own laws, and send forth a messenger with counter instructions?"

ORIGEN: "The law and the prophets are to be interpreted in a two-fold manner; one in a literal sense and the other in a spiritual sense."

There can be no doubt about it; the teachings of Jesus, as we have them, are contrary to the laws of Moses, and this brought Jesus into conflict with the Pharisees and the Chief Priests and the Sanhedrin, and finally sent Him to the Cross. However, the doctrines which Jesus taught are infinitely better for the race than the brutal and vicious laws given the Jews by Moses.

CELSUS: (Endeavoring to prove that Christians serve two masters, Celsus argues from secular affairs that) "No man can serve two masters at the same time, to undertake to do this is to be loyal to neither; the character of the master is shown by the character of the servant, and the character of the object

worshiped is always portrayed by the character of the worshipers."

ORIGEN: (Denying these conclusions Origen says) "Our Socrates said,—'Anytus and Melitus may kill me, but they cannot injure me; for it is impossible that the better shall ever be injured by the worse.' And when the unworthy executioners of Anaxarchus were afflicting him he said to his tormentors, 'Beat, beat the shell of Anaxarchus, for himself you do not beat.' And as regards the passage,—'No man can serve two masters,' these words can be perfectly true only, when they refer to the service which we render to the most High through His Son, who leadeth us to God. And we will not serve God as though He stood in need of our service, or as though He would be made unhappy if we ceased to serve Him; but we do it because we are ourselves benefited by the service of God, and because we are freed from griefs and troubles by serving the Most High God through His only begotten Son, the Word and Wisdom."

Celsus advises the Christians to lend their aid to the king in the maintenance of justice, of order; to fight for him, or to fight under him, or to lead an army along with him.

ORIGEN: "We do, when occasion requires, give help to kings, and that, so to say, a divine help, 'putting on the whole armour of God.'

And this we do in obedience to the injunction of the apostle: 'I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in authority'; and the more anyone excels in piety, the more effective help does he render to kings, even more than is given by soldiers, who go forth to fight and slay as many of the enemy as they can. And to those enemies of our faith who require us to bear arms for the commonwealth, and to slay men, we can reply: 'Do not those who are priests at certain shrines, and those who attend on certain gods, as you account them, keep their hands free from blood, that they may with hands unstained and free from human blood offer the appointed sacrifices to your gods; and even when war is upon you, you never enlist the priests in the army. If that, then, is a laudable custom, how much more so, that while others are engaged in battle, these too should engage as the priests and ministers of God, keeping their hands pure, and wrestling in prayers to God on behalf of those who are fighting in a righteous cause, and for the kings who reign righteously, that whatever is opposed to those who act righteously may be destroyed.' And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war, and lead to the violation of oaths, and disturb the

> peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the kings than those who go into the field to fight for them. And we do take our part in public affairs, when along with righteous prayers we join self-denying exercises and meditations, which teach us to despise pleasures, and not to be led away by them. And none fight better for the king than we do. We do not indeed fight under him, although he require it; but we fight on his behalf, forming a special army—an army of piety —by offering our prayers to God."

This excerpt shows that the contention of the emperors, to the effect that Christians could not be relied upon to assist the state in time of war, was true. It was on this account, historians tell us, that Diocletian began the persecution of Christians early in his reign. The first circumstance to raise his wrath was an act of insubordination of a Christian soldier at Nicomedia named Maximilianus. This act was followed closely by a centurion named Marcellus, who, on the day of a public festival, threw away his belt, his arms and his ensigns of office, and exclaimed with a loud voice,—"I will obey none but Jesus Christ the eternal King, and I renounce forever the use of carnal weapons, and the service of an idolatrous master." These men were immediately executed, but desertions from the army followed frequently. Diocletian's reign was, however, a century later

than Origen but the attitude of the Christians was the same during the first three centuries.

JULIAN

Julian came to the throne of Rome in A. D. 361. This was thirty-eight years after his imperial uncle, Constantine the Great, had been proclaimed emperor by the army in Gaul. Constantius had preceded Julian and reigned from 353 to 361. During the reign of Constantius, Julian had witnessed the assassination of his own father and three brothers, all princes, and he knew that this was compassed by the eunuchs and Christian counselors at the court of Constantius. It was therefore with feelings of intense abhorrence towards the Christians that Julian came to the throne of the Cæsars. He had been brought up under the care of Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and was familiar with the strife and bitterness which existed between the numerous sects of the Christians that had kept the empire in turmoil since the council of Nicæa, held in 325. Julian at once took steps to restore the ancient religions of Rome and Greece and to reopen the temples that had long been closed. He went to Ephesus—"where torches light themselves and statues smile"—and was initiated into the mysteries of the worship of the Ephesian goddess, Diana, attempting to substitute Neo-Platonism, a philosophical paganism, for Christianity as the state religion. It must be said of Julian, how-

ever, that he was humane and did not persecute the Christians, asserting that they were persecuting and killing themselves quite fast enough. Julian said: "The savage beasts are not more formidable to man than the Christians are to one another when they are divided by creed and opinion." And at Alexandria, that hot-bed of Christian contention and sedition, he said: "I swear by the great Serapis the contempt that is shown for all the gods fills me with grief and indignation. There is nothing that I should see, nothing that I should hear, above this, than the expulsion of Athanasius and his creed from all Egypt." Julian also averred: "I hold with derision the Mosaic history and Christianity, and I prefer the Greek poets to the Hebrew prophets." He closes a formal address with this powerful indictment against Christianity, as he saw it and understood it: "If I could make each individual citizen richer than Midas, and every city of my empire greater than was Babylon, I would not esteem myself the benefactor of mankind, unless, at the same time, I can reclaim my subjects from their impious revolt against the immortal gods."

APULEIUS

Apuleius, a very polished author of the second century, resided at Carthage, where he must have been familiar with Christianity and have witnessed numerous executions of Christians. He does not mention Jesus, and only once, and

then indirectly, refers to Christianity by causing one of his characters in the "Golden Ass," a disreputable woman, to say that she believed in the doctrines of Christianity.

The following statements are not of approved character, nor to be considered as criticisms; they are not, however, without some interest and for this reason I submit them here.

PHLEGON

Phlegon, A. D. 120, a Greek of Asia Minor and a writer on the subject of marvels and prodigies, is said by Origen to have mentioned the occurrence of an earthquake which was said to have taken place at the time of the crucifixion of Jesus. This reference is not found in any of the writings of Phlegon now extant. Phlegon was a collector of incredible stories covering a period from B. C. 700 to A. D. 135. He had been a slave in the family of Hadrian and possessed more of superstition than education.

NUMENIUS

Numenius, A. D. 160, a Pythagorean philosopher, is said by Origen to have referred to Jesus in his teaching before his classes, and always favorably. This philosopher and teacher, however, conceived of a trinity which comprised, "The Supreme Deity, the Demiurge, and the World," and could not have accorded more to

Jesus than that of being a good man and teaching a pure morality.

DIONYSIUS

Dionysius, the Areopagite, was a student in Heliopolis, in Egypt, at the time Jesus was crucified at Jerusalem. Fifty years later, while living in Athens and a member of the Christian Church and community at Athens, Dionysius asserted that he had observed the eclipse of the sun which is said to have occurred on the day Jesus was crucified, and claimed to have been so impressed at the time that he said to a fellow student at Heliopolis: "Either the Divinity suffers or sympathizes with some sufferer."

EUSEBIUS

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine, A. D. 265-340, wrote quite extensively. He records that, in his time, there were preserved, at Edessa, in Mesopotamia, the copy of a letter which had been written to Jesus, by "Abgarus who was king of Edessa in the first half of the First century," and a letter from Jesus in reply thereto. Eusebius claims that he found these letters at Edessa and they were in the Syriac language. They are to be found in Eusebius' work, "The Ecclesiastical History," Book 1, Chapter 13. An English translation of the letters was published some years ago by David McKay of Philadelphia, from which I quote.—

"Abgarus, King of Edessa,

"To Jesus the good Savior, who appears at Jerusalem; Greeting:

"I have been informed concerning thee and thy cures, which are performed without the use of medicines and herbs. For it is reported that thou causest the blind to see, the lame to walk, do both cleanse lepers and cast out unclean spirits and devils, and restorest them to health who have been long diseased, and raisest up the dead. Which when I heard, I was persuaded of one of these two; either that thou art God himself descended from Heaven who doeth these things, or the Son of God. On this account therefore I have written to thee earnestly desiring that thou wouldst take the trouble of a journey hither, and cure a disease which I am under. For I hear that the Jews ridicule thee and intend thee mischief. My city is indeed small but neat and large enough for us both. Farewell."

"Jesus, by Ananias the footman:

"To Abgarus the King, Greeting:

"Thou art happy, for as much as thou hast believed on me, whom thou hast not seen. For it is written concerning me, that those who have seen me should not believe on me, that they who have not seen might believe and live.

"As to that part of thy letter which relates to me giving thee a visit, I must inform thee that I must fulfill all the ends of my mission, and after

PROPERTY OF
MARGARET BARNETT WILLIAMS

that be received up again to Him who sent me. But after my ascension I will send one of my disciples, who will cure thy disease and give life to thee and all that are with thee. Farewell."

St. Augustine mentions an epistle of Jesus that had been written to Peter and Paul. Also he mentions an epistle of Jesus which "had been produced by the Manichees," but no quotations from these letters are given.

I infer that Christian scholars and theologians are doubtful of the authenticity of these several letters or they would not have so persistently ignored them, or the mention of them, writers whom, on other subjects, quote extensively.

III

THE SIBYLLINE BOOKS; THE LOGOS; NEO-PLATONISM; MOHAMMEDANISM

THE SIBYLLINE BOOKS

In the Apocalyptic literature which has come down to us, we find much about the "Sibylline Books." Latterly these seem to have been of Jewish origin, while, in the first instance, the "Oracle" was a woman named Sibyl. Sibyl must have had many successors, for the books cover a considerable period of time. The latest of these prophesy the coming of Jesus, the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, the supremacy of Christianity over paganism and many related matters. All this was but an effort to employ the methods of the heathen, or Gentile oracles in the interest of Jewish and Christian prophecy.

The Sibyls were quoted by the Fathers of the Church from Justin Martyr down to Lactantius, and the Sibylline oracles were used in support of Christianity until A. D. 195, at which time, it had been prophesied, Rome should be ruined. Inasmuch as the predicted ruin did not come, the theologians thereafter ceased to employ the Sibyls in support of Christian doctrine.

The Apocalypse of St. John is of the same

character as the books of the Sibyls. The impression and belief was quite general with the Christians of the second century that the prophecy of St. John, of the approaching end of the world, and the second coming of Jesus, was to be fulfilled at the end of that century. It was because this prophecy was not fulfilled that the Greek bishops of the churches of Asia, the representatives of the Seven Churches, to which the Apocalypse is addressed, met in council at Laodicea in A. D. 360, and discredited this gospel and voted it out of the canon. The Latin, or Roman Church, however, continued the book in the canon and neither undertakes to explain, nor deny, the failure of the prophecy.

Constantine made a homiletic address before an assembly of Christian bishops in which he gave two reasons, to his mind all sufficient, why he believed in the "eternal truths" of Christianity; first, that the eighth Sibylline book, of A. D. 211, contained an orphic, in the Greek text, composed of thirty-four lines, in which an acrostic was formed producing this impressive sentence: "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior of the World." Second, that the fourth book of the Eclogues, of Virgil, contained a prophecy of the coming and reign of Jesus.

I am unable to find the orphic of Sibyl, which Constantine mentioned with such implicit faith and reverence, though I have no doubt that such an orphic can be found in the Sibylline writings.

Translations of the latest of those writings were made some centuries ago. The oldest and best accredited writings, or prophecies of Sibyl, were extant and in the temple of Apollo Patrous as late as A. D. 363, and at an earlier period copies of these books were built in the walls of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill, Rome. The verses were doubtless composed by some one in the interest of Christianity, and were a pious fraud.

The prophecy contained in the fourth book of the Eclogues, written about B. C. 39, certainly does not point to Jesus. The expositors of Virgil do not interpret those beautiful verses as Constantine interpreted them. They are made by the poet to come from Sibyl ("Cumea's maid") and doubtless referred to the nuptials of Virgil's patron,—C. Asinius Pollio. Virgil frequently employs the Sibylline oracles in his works. It is remarkable that a heathen oracle and a heathen poet should have been considered by Constantine to be prophets of the coming of Jesus and heralds of His divinity. Such was the state of mind of the great pro-Christian emperor, and he appears to have become a Christian because of his belief in these ridiculous superstitions. Let us consider what would have become of the Christian religion had not Constantine embraced it and given to it the protection of the Roman empire. There probably would not have been a Nicene council, with its resultant creed of extreme trinitarian doc-

trine. Nor could the Christian religion so soon, if at all, have become a dominating influence in the empire, which developed a republic within the empire, which finally subverted Roman institutions and succeeded in placing the Papacy on the throne of the Cæsars.

THE LOGOS

This term was first used by Plato to give personality to attributes of the Deity. Nearly four hundred years later, this word became the exponent of a certain attitude of philosophic thought touching God and the visible Universe. Philo of Alexandria employs this word in his scheme of philosophy thus: "God is incorporiel, absolute, perfection, and is apprehensible only by reason. An intermediate agent is affirmed, the Logos, or idea of ideas. This Logos is God's elder son, as the world is His younger son." Philo describes, or defines the Logos as the "Image of God," "The High Priest of God," "The Son of God," and "The Man of God." Philo's definition wavers between attribute and substance and is altogether metaphysical. This doctrine had become a solvent for all problems relating to Deity and His Creation and was on everybody's tongue in the first century of our era. Justin Martyr, one of the earliest of the Christian Fathers, used this term,—the Logos, or the Word, or the Divine Word, more frequently than the more specific term "Jesus," and he closes an address to Emperor

Antoninus in these terms: "The crucified One whom we worship is the Divine Word."

The "Divine Word," or Logos, with Justin and the Gnostics generally, was, therefore, synonymous with the personal being of Jesus. The current interpretation of the "Logos" of that day, however, meant much less than was embodied in the extreme trinitarian doctrines affirmed one hundred and fifty years later, in the Nicene creed. For example: Paul, bishop of Antioch, A. D. 260, in his discussion with a sophist of Antioch expresses this idea of the Logos: "God is to be conceived as one person; from Him, however, there proceeds eternally as force, a Logos, who may be called Son. This Logos worked in the Prophets; at last in the highest degree and in a unique manner, in Jesus. Jesus is in his own nature a man, originating in time. He is from beneath, but by inspiration and indwelling, the Divine Logos worked on Him from above." We shall do well to bear this definition in mind. Many books have been written on this subject. We get the clearest understanding of it in the ante-Nicene theology. The Stoics affirmed that Reason is the ruling principle in the world, that Reason is an attribute of God, and they called this influence with men the "Logos." The early theologians, remembering the creative word of God as expressed in the Book of Genesis, and associating it with creative thought, called "The Word," the Logos. We find a phase of this doctrine in

the prologue of John's Gospel, wherein is expressed the idea of "The Word" being "made flesh" and more explicitly "the Word of God made incarnate." This doctrine, then, enabled the Greek scholars and the Greek theologians of the first and second centuries to get over the difficulty embodied in the idea of the "Immaculate Conception" of Jesus.

NEO-PLATONISM

This system of philosophical and religious thought was anticipated by Philo, a Hellenic Jew of Alexandria, who sought to harmonize the conceptions of Plato, which had agitated and charmed the intellectual world for three and a half centuries, with Jewish conceptions of the "scheme of things," as set forth by Jewish scholars from Moses down to his day. In this great work Philo contributed much, which soon after became fundamental, in the new school of Neo-Platonism.

That a doctrine should be developed by an Alexandrian Jew, which unites the conceptions of Moses with those of Plato, is one of the marvels of Egyptian speculation and scholarship. This fact is observed and tersely and charmingly narrated by Winwood Reade in his work—*The Martyrdom of Man.* Let us read a paragraph on this subject from this admirable book.—"There was a town named Heliopolis; it had a college garden, and a willow hanging over the Fountain of the Sun; and there the Professors

lectured and discoursed on the Triune God, and the creation of the world, and the Serpent Evil, and the Tree of Life; and on chaos and darkness; and the shining stars; and there the stone quadrant was pointed to the heavens; and there the laboratory furnace glowed. And in that College two foreign students were received, and went forth learned in its lore. The first created a nation in the Egyptian style; the second created a system of ideas; and, strange to say, on Egyptian soil the two were reunited; the philosophy of Moses was joined in Alexandria to the philosophy of Plato, not only by the Jews, but also by the Christians; not only in Philo Judæus, but also in the Gospel of St. John."

Philo had the advantage of Plato in having at his side the Jehovah of the Jews as a medium through which to give potency to ideas. Plato had searched everywhere in the visible world and in the kingdom of his own mind for an embodied God,—a God of form, personality and attributes —but in vain. Philo then began where Plato had made an end and affirmed with Moses: "In the beginning Jehovah created the Heavens and the Earth," and then proceeded to explain how this was done; maintaining that Jehovah first had the Idea of a world and that the potency of a Divine Idea was such that it clothed itself in substance and form. And so with regard to the creation of the Flora and Fauna of the world; that Jehovah had the idea of a plant,

and the species of a plant, and that the power contained in this idea took visible form in the plant. And that the species of animals, including man, were so many incarnations of the thoughts of Jehovah, "so many material representations of Divine Ideas."

We can see at once that this doctrine is the very opposite of that held by modern thought—that it is opposed to the science of evolution.

Philo was a man of liberal learning and an enthusiastic worker. He was forty years old when Jesus was crucified, but Christianity had not, apparently, risen to public notice in his day. The teachings of Philo and the ethical precepts of Plato and of Aristotle formed the moral structure of Neo-Platonism. In addition to this there was a spiritual conception which was developed along lines of mysticism and asceticism. Its assumptions were: that there is a Primeval Being, an Ideal World, a Soul, and a Phenomenal World. And it taught that, "the soul in its longings reaches out and up beyond all sensible things, even beyond the world of ideas," and that it follows, that, "the highest being must be superrational." This was a religious system without rewards and punishments. It presupposes a soul, "with longings to reach up and beyond sensible things"; and this longing will make men good. It teaches moral precepts which will supplement the "longing of the soul to reach up and beyond sensible things," and it proclaims

an asceticism which induces thought and desire for an ultimate union with the "Primeval Being."

The philosophy of Plato and Aristotle had no religious significance. Their ethics were for here and now. Neo-Platonism, however, gave a religious significance to morals and taught that the effect of morals was both here and hereafter. It had nothing to do however with faith. It had no sacrifice and no priesthood. It did not lean on philosophy; on the contrary, philosophy gives way to supernaturalism and to a bold idealism. It affirms that beyond sense-perception and beyond rational cognition, is a fountain of life and energy and that this may be felt in a subjective state.

Emperor Julian in A. D. 361, undertook to adopt and establish Neo-Platonism in place of Christianity, which had been made the state religion, by his uncle, Constantine the Great; but the masses would not have it. It did not sufficiently excite the imagination nor stimulate and feed their superstitions; to them it lacked the personality of a crucified Jesus; it lacked a sacrifice and the warmth of flesh and blood, which characterized Christianity and which appealed mightily to a barbarous people. Many of the Fathers of the Church, especially the renowned Origen and later Saint Augustine, were Neo-Platonists, and Christian theology was, in degree, shaped and molded by the doctrines of this

school of thought at Alexandria. It seems that religions, as well as creatures in the physical world, are subject to the law of evolution. When the brilliant and aggressive Porphyry became a leader in the school of Neo-Platonism, the lines which had long run parallel between Christianity and Neo-Platonism became divergent. Porphyry made no criticisms of Jesus, nor of what he believed to be the teachings of Jesus, nor of Nazarene Christianity, but he unsparingly condemned the Christian writings and claimed that they were the work of ignorant, if not designing men. Porphyry wrote a criticism of the Christian religion A. D. 270, and undertook to show what he considered was the teaching of Jesus and what he considered "myths." His works were gathered together and destroyed by Theodosius II, A. D. 448, in the interest of Christianity, and we do not now know what his criticisms were. In speaking of the theologian, Origen, Porphyry says: "His outer life was that of a Christian but his views of things and of God were those of the Greeks whose conceptions he overlaid with foreign myths." Origen was one of the greatest theologians of his day, a convert from Neo-Platonism.

Neo-Platonism had largely absorbed the schools of philosophy, had broken down the system of nature-worship, and had thus opened the door to Christianity. There came about much jealousy, especially in the centers of learning and at Alexandria. Christianity had drawn largely

from Neo-Platonism and the schools were no longer as popular and well filled with students as in earlier years. Since Emperor Constantine had made Christianity the state religion, it was bearing down all opposition. Still, one gifted teacher of Neo-Platonism remained at Alexandria; that teacher was Hypatia. Her school was popular and her influence great. Christianity was jealous of her and her work. Bishop Cyril, of the church at Alexandria, caused Hypatia to be apprehended and brutally assassinated in the Christian church,—the cæsarium. This occurrence broke up the remaining school and the doctrines of Neo-Platonism were no longer taught in Alexandria, nor in lower Egypt. A school was then established in Athens, which was later suppressed by Justinian, at the behest of Christian bishops.

We will do well to remember that it was an anti-Christian mob at Jerusalem, incited by Priest and Scribe, that dragged Stephen forth from the Sanhedrin and stoned him to his death; and that it was a pro-Christian mob at Alexandria, incited by a Christian bishop, that dragged Hypatia from her schoolroom to the cæsarium and with unspeakable insults consigned her to the flames.

The Koran. Mohammedanism was taken from Judaism and Christianity. All great religions were born, or revealed, in the seclusion of the wilderness.

Moses retired to the fastness of Sinai and there

for forty days "talked with God," and from Him received the law which saith: "THOU SHALT NOT!" which law has governed the Jews for three thousand five hundred years.

The prophets, from their seclusion came forth from age to age and prophesied: "THUS SAITH THE LORD."

John the Baptist came out of the wilderness unto the people, crying: "REPENT! REPENT!"

Jesus, before beginning his ministry, retired to the wilderness and after fasting forty days showed himself to the people and preached that memorable "SERMON ON THE MOUNT."

Paul retired to the wilderness of Arabia, after his conversion and baptism at Damascus, and upon his return began to preach the new doctrine of "SALVATION BY FAITH."

Mohammed, had a vision, while in retirement on Mount Hira, near Mecca. The angel Gabriel appeared to him and bade him write; and thus the Koran was given to Mohammed, a new religion born, with a new prophet to expound it.

It appears that Mohammed had been a camel driver and that in his travels he had frequently stopped at the monastery of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, and had learned of the Jewish Scriptures and had become familiar with the Arian views of Christianity from the monks of that monastery. He had also visited the Nestorian monastery at Bozrah in Syria in A. D. 581, when

but twelve years of age, and had been taught by the monks of Bozrah their views of Christianity. From Arian and Nestorian Christianity, Mohammed received his early prejudice against the trinitarian doctrines of Catholic Christianity. We are not surprised, therefore, to find the revelations of Gabriel to Mohammed to be, largely, a rearrangement of the Old Testament scriptures, with a decided monotheistic bias; and to find Christianity robbed of its trinitarian doctrines.

The God of Mohammed is the God of the Jews. Prayer was offered at first by the devotee with his face towards Jerusalem, later, towards Mecca. The precepts of this religion are, first: confession of the Unity of God. Second: stated prayer shall be made. Third: almsgiving is enjoined. Fourth: fasts and festivals shall be observed. Fifth: the Jewish ceremonials, purification and circumcision are enjoined. I would not offer an explanation of the doctrines of Mohammedanism, in this inquiry, but for the fact that more than 175,000,000 people believe in the inspiration and truth of the Koran; and for the further fact that Mohammedanism is a sister religion to Christianity. For the God of the Jews is also the God of the Mohammedans as well as the God of the Christians and therefore we find the kinship of these religions in their common God. It is a sound proposition in logic, that "things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other."

The "Lord's Prayer" of the Moslems follows:

"Praise be to God, the Lord of all Creatures. The most merciful, the King of the Day of Judgment. Thee do we worship, and of Thee do we beg assistance. Direct us in the right way, in the way of those to whom Thou hast been gracious, not of those against whom Thou art incensed nor of those who go astray. . . . O God bestow thy salutation of peace upon Mohammed and the race of Mohammed, as Thou didst upon Ibraham and the race of Ibraham, and bless Mohammed and the race of Mohammed, as Thou didst bless Ibraham and the race of Ibraham."

The Mohammedans believe in Heaven, in Hell, in the Resurrection, in Predestination and in Fasts and Prayer. Prayer must be offered five times daily. They deny the miraculous birth of Jesus and deny that he rose from the dead. In the first part of the Koran the sentiments expressed in prayer are elevating and compare fairly well with the Psalms of David. But after the Mohammedans had taken up the cimiter and battle ax and gone forth to conquer, the tone of the Koran changes; for the Koran was not written, or revealed, all at one time. Later it became a work of protest largely against the belief of the "Infidels." Various quotations from the Koran will disclose much of doctrine.—

"Whoever shall give a companion unto God, God shall exclude him from paradise and his habitation shall be hell-fire."

"Christ, the Son of Mary, is no more than an apostle, other apostles have preceded him and his mother was a woman of veracity; they both ate food."

"They who devour usury shall not rise from the dead."

"If ye take vengeance on any, take a vengeance proportionable to the wrong done you."

"Moreover ye and that which ye worship shall not seduce any concerning God, except him who is destined to be burnt in hell."

Mohammed's description of heaven is that of a royal harem. His description of hell is much like a chamber of horrors or a charnel house.

I have nothing to say in defense of Mohammedanism but we may remember that while mediaeval Europe was groping through the darkness of superstition; while the Church was persecuting Galileo, Copernicus, Kepler and Bruno and all others who would investigate and think for themselves; the arts and the schools of mathematics were flourishing in Arabia. That form of analyses which we know as algebra was devised and developed in Arabia. The art of making paper was discovered by Arabians. The most important discovery in the realm of physical science was made by those early Mohammedan scholars, namely: the sphericity of the earth. A most interesting phenomenon had been observed by them; the tops of objects on the deserts and

plains at a distance could only be seen, the bases were below the line of vision. Only the sails on boats far out at sea were visible. The body of the boats, at the water line, could not be seen. These phenomena caused certain Arabian scholars to make careful observations with instruments on the plains and sea shores of Arabia. It was thus ascertained that the surface line when extended over a considerable distance, deflected sensibly downward from a horizontal line. This gave them the arc and by more extended measurements they found the degree of deflection, or curvature of the arc. With these data they dropped their instruments and had recourse to their mathematics; they knew that a horizontal line was capable of indefinite extension, but were amazed, when extending the arc with a given degree of curvature, to find that the line came around to them and formed the great circle and this circle was the line denoting the circumference of the earth. It was then easy to determine the radius. And so it thus became known to the Mohammedan Arabs, that the world was round, seven hundred years before Columbus demonstrated it by sailing westward from Palos.[7]

The Mohammedans have had their synods and councils; these have interpreted the Koran in

[7] Two earlier attempts were made by Greek scholars to determine the form of the earth, but without success. The Pythagoreans had observed the shadow of the earth on the moon and had affirmed that the earth is a planet and its form round.

much the same fashion that the early Christian Church established its creed. There is a Moslem party of dissent from the orthodox dogma and this party holds views similar to those of the Greek philosophers, especially Aristotle and the scholars of Alexandria which so mightily influenced Christian thought in the first and second centuries. Foremost among the Arabian philosophers who were expounders of the philosophy of Aristotle and who may be called "Peripatetics" were Averroes and Al-Gazzali. While Mohammedanism is intolerant to the outer world it is quite tolerant within. No systematic persecution, no Torquemada and Inquisition ever had footing in Mohammedan countries. The "Infidelity" of the learned body of dissidents is found expressed in "The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam":

Some for the glories of this world; and some
Sigh for the Prophet's Paradise to come;
Ah, take the cash, and let the credit go,
Nor heed the rumble of a distant drum.

. . . . .

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and saint, and heard great argument
About it and about; but ever more
Came out by the same door wherein I went.

. . . . .

Oh threats of Hell and hopes of Paradise!
One thing at least is certain, this life flies;
One thing is certain and the rest is lies,
The flower that once has bloomed forever dies.

There is but little proselyting done by preaching; Mohammed made converts by the sword. The Koran does not disclose the manner of evangelizing, if indeed any such effort is made at all. From another source I cull a sermon which savors of the modern Christian Evangelist,—from the Mohammedan Ben-al-Hetif. . .

"Ye miserable earth worms called men, what have you resembling the glory of the Supreme Being? How long, ye two legged animals without feathers, will you make God after your own image? Humble yourselves in the dust; adore and be silent." And the people cried out: "Glory to God, Ben-al-Hetif has said well."

Those who inveigh so strenuously against the alleged bad faith of the Moslem, must remember that there are always two sides to a question, especially when it is a religious question. Let us read a page from history.*

"In the year A. D. 1444, after the sword had been flashing over the Balkans, and through Greece and Asia Minor and along the Bosphorus and the Danube, it was agreed that it should be sheathed and have an absolute rest for ten years. The Hungarians, through their leaders, among whom their grand champion, Hunyades, was prominent, gave the sanction of soldierly honor to this truce. Cardinal Julian also confirmed it,

* *Diversions of a Diplomat in Turkey,* by S. S. Cox.

by the rites of the religion of which he was an exalted representative. It was signalized by oath upon the Gospels—the most sacred oath possible to a Christian. On the part of the Turks, the Sultan Amurath, in the presence of his civil and ecclesiastical servants, swore to the pact upon the Koran. This peace was strictly observed by the Turks. How was it observed by the Christians? As they never intended to keep it, they broke it. Its breach was made on the plea that there was no faith to be kept with the Infidel. In disregard of its sanctity, the Christian Powers move upon the East. It seems as if the Ottoman would be swept out of Europe. But what is the result? The Moslem starts the old war-cry. He has the *morale* of the issue. In every mosque there are solemn appeals to Allah. The Sultan leads the hosts of the Faithful against the invaders at Varna; and at the head of the Janizaries, on a truce and in a field between the two armies, he reads aloud the violated treaty. It is held aloft upon a lance-head within sight of the Christian armies, and with a thunderous voice the Sultan utters this most singular invocation: 'O Thou insulted Jesu! avenge the wrong done unto Thy good name, and show Thy power upon Thy perjured people.'

"It is not necessary to say upon whose banner victory alights. The perjured are routed."

IV

THE SCHOOLS OF GREECE

THE PYTHAGOREANS

It is well to consider what course our civilization would probably have taken if Christianity had not developed into an important system of ethics and religion. We would still have been the inheritors of Roman law and of the Roman and Grecian civilization. The schools of Greek philosophy and ethics would doubtless have evolved all that we now know, and, probably, more, for if these schools had not been interrupted by Christian interdiction for upwards of ten centuries our civilization, in so far as it has been influenced by philosophy, investigation and interpretation, would have been far in advance of its present knowledge and achievements. Let us examine this subject somewhat in detail.

The Phythagoreans, B. C. 500, the oldest of the Greek schools, aimed at the moral education, and purification of the life of the individual citizen, believing that if the units were characterized by morality and intelligence, the state would likewise be so characterized and thus the individual citizen and the state attain to the "greatest good." Certainly our statesmen, under

a Christian civilization, have no such high ideals. Then, let us remember that this school was the first to affirm, and in a measure to demonstrate the heliocentric theory of our solar system. This theory necessarily changed our flat and stationary earth to a planet, set it in motion and gave to it the form of a spheroid. This conception was fully demonstrated to be true, in the fifteenth century, by Copernicus and Galileo, though bitterly opposed by Christianity, for Christianity had, from its youth adopted the Ptolemaic system, or view, of a flat earth, with the sun and moon revolving around it, all for the benefit, wonder and enjoyment of man. We may affirm that Christianity retarded the growth of our knowledge of the universe, as shown by its opposition to the science of astronomy, for fifteen centuries, and allowed generation after generation to die in total ignorance of the sublime truths of this science and their implications.

This school was renowned for its advanced conceptions and studies in mathematics, in geometry and in physics; all those who saw beauty in form and line, and could discern rhythm in motion, naturally attached themselves to this cult. In dietetics, it was vegetarian; its adherents could not think of eating flesh. The students drank no wine, and wore only linen clothing. Silence was enjoined on those students who could not express themselves in speech clearly, briefly and to the point; all such were taught reflection and self-

examination until they could co-ordinate speech with sound thinking. This method eliminated all vain and frivolous conversation. The course of study and discipline comprised a period of five years. Many of the philosophers of Greece were graduated from the Pythagorean schools, and it is said that the bonds of fellowship which held the disciples of Pythagoras together were so strong that should a member become estranged or apostatize, a cenotaph was invariably raised to his name, thus proclaiming him dead. What rich fruit might the evolution and development of such conceptions have brought to the race, during the past nineteen centuries, the most of which was an age of darkness, had it not been for the interruption, or we may say, the intrusion, of the Christian religion?

THE SOPHISTS

Little that can be said of this school, as the Sophists did not develop, or hold to, a scheme of morals, or religion. They had become a well defined body in Greece, in the time of Socrates; it was they who brought the formal charge against him and urged it before the jury which gave the unjust judgment of death. This body of public pleaders held a pre-eminent place in Greece for about one hundred years, when Sophistry began to give way to philosophy and to more exact and consistent methods of thought and practice.

Sophistry as a science was applied to culture, to rhetoric, to politics and to disputation. It appears to have found its widest field and greatest activity in formal disputation. In argument it had but one maxim,—"the end justifies the means." It esteemed style and expression above matter and facts; it sought effect rather than accuracy and regarded persuasion above proof. It prostituted logic, sacrificed truth, ignored honesty—all, that it might attain its end and the emoluments which unscrupulous success in politics and in other fields of activity might bring. Socrates sacrificed everything that deterred him from apprehending truth; his contemporary Sophists put aside everything that did not contribute to their distinction and fill their purses.

The Sophists were well established in Athens when Plato founded his Academy there, and we may affirm with confidence that Plato and his philosophy were a living and energetic protest against them and their intellectual methods of disingenuousness. Sophistry, however, had given way to philosophy long before Christianity had become a power in the Roman empire and we can not ascribe to the new cult the honor of overcoming this system, which had in it nothing of merit aside from its educational effect in dexterity of dialectic.

PLATO

I will not attempt to set out the doctrines and

philosophy of Plato, if indeed I were able to do so. Plato traveled over every road of inquiry which the human mind, up to his day, was at all acquainted with, setting interrogation points along the way of his research and inquiry, as the Romans, later, set up milestones along the road from the Aurelian gate of the city to the utmost bounds of Gaul.

It was from the almost unlimited investigations and questionings of Plato that, later, many of the schools of Greece appropriated their characteristic doctrines; and so we shall find much of Plato in the concepts and precepts of the several schools of Greece. I have set out elsewhere the doctrines of the school of "Neo-Platonism," as far as these relate to morals and religion. We should bear in mind, however, as we proceed with our inquiry, that the great schools of philosophy, and especially of ethics, of Greece were finally drawn into the conflict and contest which arose between Christianity and Neo-Platonism and that they were largely absorbed by these rival systems, not however without a desperate and prolonged struggle.

THE CYNICS

This school arose immediately after the death of Socrates. It came from a social and educational point of view, as a protest against the state of society in Greece in the fourth century, B. C. It was an active and influential force in

the Greek states for about one century, when it lost many of its ideals and followers to Stoicism. This school held to no religious views, but made many claims for plain living. It taught and emphasized a mode of life and a mode of dress. Realism was their philosophy as opposed to idealism; this arrayed the Cynics against Plato and his school. Diogenes was an early disciple of this school and did much to give it character in his day.

Crates was an enthusiastic Cynic; he was rich, but when he joined this school, he put all his property in the hands of trustees with instructions to give it to his sons at their majority, "if they become ordinary fools, but if they should become philosophers they will not want it and in that event give it all to the poor." In the debates of the Cynics the problem as to what are the bare necessities of man appears to be ever uppermost; "What does his nature require?" When these facts were well understood among them, they made certain precepts to govern and fortify themselves against the extravagance and luxury and conventions of contemporaneous society. "We have only to reduce our wants in order to have plenty." This is a truly philosophical statement, full of truth, and a complete system of political and domestic economy might be built upon it.

The Cynics stood together with cold indifference to the severe criticisms of society and were

ever insistent in proclaiming their own virtues. Theagenes, a Cynic of the first century A. D., closed a remarkable panegyric on the life of a fellow Cynic, Peregrin, on the day before Peregrin immolated himself on a burning pyre at the Olympian games. The Cynic closes his panegyric in this manner: "Peregrin, Peregrin vain-glorious! Who dares name the word? Earth, Sun, Seas, Rivers, God of our Fathers, Heracles! Was it for this that he suffered bondage in Syria? Was it for this that he forgave his country a debt of a million odd? Was it for this that he was cast out of Rome? He whose brilliance exceeds the Sun, fit rival of the Lord of Olympus; 'tis his good will to depart from life by fire, and they call it vain-glorious? What other end had Heracles? . . . The world has seen but two works of surpassing excellence,—The Olympian Zeus, and Peregrin. The one we owe to the creative genius of Phidias, the other is nature's handiwork. And now the god-like statue departs from among mankind; borne upon wings of fire; he seeks the heavens and leaves us desolate!"

The Cynics had one real virtue, they could not be bought; they esteemed their doctrines above money. The command of Jesus to the rich young man, to sell his possessions and give all to the poor, had its parallel with the Cynics, three centuries before Jesus.

Seneca wrote of the Cynic, Demetrus, a con-

temporary, in the reign of Nero: "Nature brought him forth to show mankind how an exalted genius may live uncorrupted by the vice of the world."

By the second century, A. D., Cynicism had become virile and influential asceticism, was largely absorbed by Neo-Platonism and a part of it found expression and habitation in Christian monasticism. In the end it appears to have been swallowed up along with Platonism in this phase of Christianity. On the whole, Cynicism never wrought a permanent good and the world lost nothing when this school of thought and conduct ceased to exert an independent influence.

THE STOICS, B. C. 304

The Stoics established their schools throughout Greece and in the Greek cities that had grown up in the countries of Asia, which had been subdued by Alexander the great. As Greek culture and Greek civilization had followed the army of Alexander into the remote and mysterious East, even to the shore of the Indus, so had the schools of the Stoics penetrated and spread over all of Judea, Persia, Arabia and Egypt, and, later, when the fragments of the Macedonian empire fell into the lap of Rome, the fortunes of these schools came with the empire, and Rome herself became their patron.

This school was developed by Zeno, who borrowed much from Plato and from the Cynics. The trinity worshiped by the Stoics was Physics,

Logic and Ethics. Ethics was the end of all useful knowledge, that is, knowledge that can be realized in virtue. We may gain quickly an understanding of Stoicism by considering a proposition of Plato in the "Sophist." A group of students hold that all things are "corporeal." A stranger appears and seeks to prove to them the existence of some things "incorporeal" and proceeds to question them in this manner:

Question: Do you admit of the existence of an animate body?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Is soul then something existent?

Answer: Yes.

Question: And the qualities of soul, as Justice and Wisdom, are they visible and tangible?

Answer: No.

Question: Do they then exist?

Now the Stoics met this dilemma with the assertion that soul, and the qualities of soul, as Justice and Wisdom, do truly exist, but only as attributes of "body" and are therefore "corporeal." Now to affirm that Force, and Form, and Motion are but qualities of matter is a correlative proposition; hence we see that modern materialism has its foundation in the affirmations, if not in the pantheism, of the Stoics. We are now led to see the importance of the first essential study in the curriculum of the Stoic school, which was Physics. That we may be impressed by, and

have a clear understanding of the doctrine of the Stoics in the foregoing proposition, we have only to consider its opposite doctrine, as found in the assumptions of Plato in his metaphysical speculations; that soul, and the attributes of soul, such as Justice and Wisdom, exist independently of "body" and aside from it, and that body and form are but incidental and visible expressions of soul. The proposition of the Stoics, when applied to the Cosmos, becomes a chief assumption of Physics. The proposition of Plato is an important postulate of Metaphysics.

Under the term "Logic" were included studies in rhetoric, dialectics and grammar. Many of the terms now used by grammarians were coined and handed down to us by the Stoics. This school became proficient in the use of analysis and employed this method with great exactitude and effect in arriving at conclusions; but the end of all studies was to be realized in ethics. "We should not act on impulse or emotion. We should act on reason." This reason is the "Logos," which later became a famous doctrine of Philo and the early Christians. It is reason alone which produces a life of self-consistency and harmony. The Cynics expressed the same opinion, in a more abrupt manner, in their familiar aphorism: "Man needs either reason or a halter." Reason and nature are at one; therefore a harmonious life is one in harmony with nature. "If our souls are hurried into an inflamed and dis-

orderly condition, erroneous judgments and false opinions follow." Evils and vices are settled dispositions, contrary to right reason and proceed from ignorance.

The Stoics were not opposed to nature-worship, as the idealism which such worship developed was esteemed to be helpful. They were afflicted, somewhat, by the superstitions of their age and environment. "Omens and portents," they admitted, "as the natural symptoms of certain occurrences." Centuries later, Scott expressed the idea better, when he wrote: "Coming events cast their shadows before." Formal worship was not enjoined. Emperor Aurelius, who was a Stoic, said: "He who fears death either fears the loss of sensation, or a different kind of sensation. But if thou shalt have no sensation, neither wilt thou feel any harm; and if thou shalt acquire another kind of sensation, thou wilt be a different kind of living being and thou wilt not cease to live. However do not forget that we live here and now. Make sure that those to whom thou come nearest be the happier by thy presence." The "Lord's Prayer of the Stoics" follows:

"Most glorious of immortals, O Zeus of many names, almighty and everlasting, Sovereign of Nature, directing all in accordance with law, thee it is fitting that all mortals should address. Thee all this universe, as it rolls circling round the earth (?), obeys wheresoever thou dost guide,

and gladly owns thy sway. Such a minister thou holdest in thy invincible hands, the two edged, fiery, ever-living thunderbolt, under whose stroke all nature shudders. No work upon earth is wrought apart from thee, Lord, nor through the divine ethereal sphere, nor upon the sea; save whatsoever wicked men do in their own foolishness. Nay, thou knowest how to make even the rough smooth, and to bring order out of disorder; and things not friendly are friendly in thy sight. For so hast thou fitted all things together, the good with the evil, that there might be one eternal law over all. Deliver men from fell ignorance. Banish it, Father, from their soul, and grant them to obtain wisdom, whereon relying, thou rulest all things with justice."

The ethics, then, of the Stoics comprised and combined right living and right acting. The end sought was not future reward, for they did not believe in the continuity of conscious life. They believed, however, that if there is in us a spiritual faculty, which survives the dissolution of the body, it will return to the fountain of spirit life, from which it had been drawn and appropriated. Besides, to do right for the hope of reward was, to the Stoic mind, a selfish and a mean motive, partaking of the nature of expediency. Nor did their ethics enjoin right living and right acting, because such a course would please God, for this was, to the Stoics, too remote a contingency; they sought and used a present motive for determining

the quality of daily actions. They enjoined right living and right acting, because such a course was right in itself, for "morality is its own excuse for being."

Such motives developed the stern, cold and inflexible character of the Stoic which, under certain conditions, led him to prefer to cease to be rather than to violate the principles of his manhood. Many of the austere Romans of the last two centuries of the republic were Stoics. These men were able to rule the world and, at the same time, govern their individual selves. A century later, under the emperors, the nobility of Rome, who were the flower and fruitage of six centuries of character building, under a liberal, energetic and progressive government, were Stoics. These men would not bend obsequiously to the vicious and corrupt princes,—the insufferable Domitians and Neros of that century. Here was a generation of truly noble men, whose greatness of soul was born of high ideals and who were not creatures of chance, or of fortuitous circumstances. Members of this class preferred to open their veins, and let their blood flow, rather than dishonor their country, the memory of their ancestors, or degrade themselves. This attitude led to the adoption of this aphorism: "I possess a treasure which not all the world can rob me of—no one can deprive me of death."

The Stoics valued their ideals above life, and their manhood above expediency.

Does our Christian civilization to-day hold up better ideals for the citizen, than those of the Stoic school, which it supplanted?

THE EPICUREANS

In 300 B. C. there was at Melite, a suburb of Athens, a garden of exquisite beauty, which surrounded a modest dwelling. Here, a large number of studious men and women met daily to consider and discuss the problems of life. This beautiful garden had been dedicated by Epicurus to the school for the study of ethical questions and was open to his disciples at all hours of the day. Never was knowledge pursued in more lovely surroundings; it was an enchantment of flowers, of blooming shrubs and of fragrant groves. If the beauty of a picture is enhanced by an appropriate and pleasing background, so was this system of ethics made impressive and attractive by the loveliness of its early environment.

Epicureanism was a reaction from the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle; a relaxation from the exalted conceptions and postulates of Platonism and Peripateticism. It denied the dualism between mind and matter, a dualism for which Plato had contended, and in his system had developed with most potent reasoning and splendid logic. It was a system without ideals. It took human nature as it found it and accepted its promptings as authoritative. It put feelings

above reason and tested conceptions and propositions by appeal to sensation. Its familiar maxim was: "Whatever we effectively feel in consciousness is real." Thus idealism was shut out. Mind, spirit, or soul, as a self-existent entity was denied: "All that exists is corporeal—the intangible is non-existent." A little earlier there had been Pyrrho and his disciples doubting the testimony of the senses, denying utterly any criterion of truth. All is mere appearance, all is relative. How do we know that the object is in fact what, to our senses, it appears to be? Things appear differently to different individuals. Had we more than five senses, the object would have more than five qualities, more than five aspects. Who can tell that our sensations are true images of the things sensed? Thus reasoned Pyrrho; not so Epicurus.

The Epicureans revived the doctrines of the Cyrenaic philosophers with such modifications as Platonism and Peripateticism had made necessary. Epicurus was walking in the "flowery and perfumed paths," which Aristippus had trod two centuries earlier and many precepts of the Cyrenaic school were appropriated by him: "The world within me and without flows away like a river, therefore let me make the most of what is here and now." The sense of beauty, which was so strong a characteristic of intellectual and ethical Greece, was expressed by this school axiomatically thus: "The true value of a soul is

in proportion to what it can admire." And this beautiful aphorism on duty is handed down from Aristippus: "Pass then through this little space of time conformably to nature, and end thy journey in content, just as an olive falls off when it is ripe, blessing nature who produced it, and thanking the tree on which it grew." That our troubles are largely imaginary was realized by the disciples of this early school, who gave us a valuable suggestion in this: "To-day I have got out of all trouble, or rather I have cast out all trouble, for it was not outside, but within and in my opinions."

The method of reasoning employed by Epicurus was by analogy. Touching the universe, two things are affirmed: "Atoms and the Void." He borrows from Democritus the thought and expression: "The world is a fortuitous concourse of atoms." With Epicurus, "space is infinite and there are illimitable multitudes of indestructible and indivisible atoms in perpetual motion. In this infinite space the atoms are ever giving rise to new worlds, and these worlds are moving towards dissolution and new series of creations."

In this conception we have a more exalted view of the world than that adopted by Christianity four hundred years later,—of a flat earth of limited extent, around which the sun and stars revolve for the benefit and wonder of man and for the glory of the God of the Jews.

Epicurus believed in the gods of Greece; that

"they were a higher order of being than man," but not the rulers of man. He would not deny the free-will and moral agency of man. He advocated the worship of the gods, for that "we are benefited by the influence of worship reacting on ourselves." And he affirmed that "worship should not be inspired by either hope or fear." Man has but one existence; his conception is at one end of life and his grave at the other. If a string has one end, it must likewise have two ends; to affirm a beginning is to presuppose an ending.

Pleasure is the good thing to be attained; not sensuality, but a negative state in which there is no pain of body or of mind. Darkness is simply the absence of light, so with the Epicureans, pleasure is the absence of pain; not exuberance and excitement, but quiet peace of mind. Prudential wisdom was all in all. "We must balance the claims of each meditated pleasure against the evils that may ensue." We must weigh consequences. While the Epicureans put a high value on certain branches of the sciences and of learning, especially on physics, logic and ethics, yet they strenuously opposed the more exclusive and isolated life of the truly great scholars and philosophers of the previous century. They believed in a commonwealth of happy people, rather than an aristocracy of intellectuals. We have an erroneous idea of the character of the Epicureans. They were not sensualists, as we understand that

term. Neither do we properly and fully estimate the character of the Stoics. They were not cold and implacable, nor were all the Cynics cynical.

Epicurus was a man of plain appearance and simple tastes. His meals consisted of "barley bread, some Cythnian cheese and a half pint of wine." The Epicureans at Rome, surrounded by and associated with wealth and power, were not as circumspect in taste and habits as their brethren in more humble circumstances at Athens.

The excellent and renowned Lucretius was an Epicurean. This virile thinker of the first century, B. C., opposed the superstitions of his time. He was possessed with a "divine doubt." He appealed to the revelations of nature and denied the supernatural government of the world; concerning the probabilities of a future life, he was doubtful. He said (Munro's translation): "Now when ye suppose that the gods designed all things for the sake of men, ye seem to me in all respects to have strayed most widely from true reason." Lucretius lived at the time when the earth was thought to be flat and the sun, moon and stars revolved around it. He was the first evolutionist: "Nothing can come from nothing, none of the things, therefore, which seem to be lost is utterly lost, since nature replenishes one thing out of another and does not suffer anything to be begotten." Darwin's law of the survival of the fittest was anticipated by Lucretius: "For in the case of all things which you see breathing the

PROPERTY OF
MARGARET BARNETT WILLIAMS

breath of life, either craft, or courage, or else speed, has from the beginning of its existence protected and preserved each particular race." The primary conditions of creation: "The elemental atoms and space." And he seems to have been inspired when he said: "The source of human ills is the fear of the gods and of death."

The elder Pliny was an Epicurean. Near the end of the eighth decade of our era, in the reign of Vespasian, there were three men writing, whose works will never die or be forgotten. These men, closely associated in time and place, yet apparently unacquainted with one another, held opinions radically different, if not diametrically opposite. Of these, St. Luke—the Synoptist—was a Greek and a convert to Christianity. (And we should remember that a "convert" is one whose opinions have been taken from, or impressed upon him by another and not derived from the exercise of his own reason and initiative.) Josephus—a Jew; while in Judea, a Pharisee; when at Rome, a Stoic. And Pliny the naturalist, a Roman and Epicurean. The first dedicated his work to Theophilus and wrote from Rome. The second dedicated his work to Emperor Vespasian, and wrote at Rome. The third dedicated his work to Titus and wrote from Naples. With the opinions of Luke and Josephus we are familiar enough; let us read from Pliny.—

"All men, after their last day, return to what they were before the first; and after death there

is no more sensation left in the body, or in the soul, than there was before birth. But, this same vanity of ours extends even to the future, and lyingly fashions to itself an existence, even in the very moments which belong to death itself; at one time, it has conferred upon us the immortality of the soul; at another transmigration; and at another, it has given sensation to the shades below, and paid divine honors to the departed spirit, thus making a kind of deity of him who has but just ceased to be a man. As if, indeed, the mode of breathing with man was in any way different from that of other animals, and as if there were not many other animals to be found whose life is longer than that of man, and yet for whom no one ever presaged anything of a like immortality. For what is the actual substance of the soul, when taken by itself? Of what material does it consist? Where is the seat of its thoughts? How is it to see, or hear, or how to touch? And then, of what use is it, or what can it avail, if it has not these faculties? Where, too, is its residence, and what vast multitudes of these souls and spirits must there be after the lapse of so many ages? But all these are the mere figments of childish ravings, and of that mortality, which is so anxious never to cease to exist. It is a similar piece of vanity, too, to preserve the dead bodies of men; just like the promise that he shall come to life again, which was made by Democritus; who, however, never has come to life again himself. Out upon it! What downright madness is it to

suppose that life is to recommence after death? or indeed, what repose are we ever to enjoy, when we have been once born, if the soul is to retain its consciousness in heaven, and the shades of the dead in the infernal regions? This pleasing delusion, and this credulity, quite cancel that chief good of human nature, death, and, as it were, double the misery of him who is about to die, by anxiety as to what is to happen to him after it. And, indeed, if life really is a good, to whom can it be so to have once lived?

"How much more easy, then, and how much more devoid of all doubts, is it for each of us to put his trust in himself, and guided by our knowledge of what our state has been before birth, to assume that that after death will be the same."

(BVII. C56.)

The Epicurean school of philosophy was an important one down to A. D. 300. It was one of the four great schools (Platonists, Peripatetics, Stoics, and Epicureans) endowed by Athens by Marcus Aurelius, himself a Stoic, in A. D. 150.

Epicureanism existed as a protest against Neo-Platonism and Christianity until some time after Constantine gave character and protection to Christianity—well into the fourth century. It appears again with more or less influence as a protest against institutional Christianity, in Europe, during the Renaissance. It was a power over the Roman world for a period of over seven

hundred years, and Epicurean doctrine has its followers to this day.

THE PERIPATETICS

There is nothing in the realm of romance more interesting than the story of the struggle of peripatetic doctrine with ignorance, with superstition, with other schools or systems of philosophy, with Christianity, with alien races and with alien religions. It proved to be the leaven, that leavened the lump of ignorance and superstition, which had settled down over Europe with a pall of darkness; the leaven, which caused the rebirth and transformation; the leaven, that early in our era, energized the scholars of Arabia and Persia and which, later, bore more and better fruit in Europe than any other system of ethics or philosophy.

Aristotle, the founder of the Peripatetic school, left the court of Philip of Macedon, where he had been engaged as teacher of Alexander, and returned to Athens in the year B. C. 335. He was forty-nine years of age. Aristotle had lived in Athens before he was called to the house of Philip, during which earlier residence there, he was a student of Plato's; so he was not returning a stranger to Athens or unknown to the scholars of that city, then famous for its culture and learning. Demosthenes was living at Athens at this time, and the memory and grave of Socrates were still fresh in the minds and to the eyes of

the people of the city of the Violet Crown.

Aristotle at once established his school, locating it in the east side of the city, "in the covered walks near the Temple of Apollo," where he taught, while walking through the shaded grounds about the temple; hence, his disciples were called "Peripatetics."

Here, the system of Aristotle was developed; here, he wrote his great and most profound system of philosophy, logic and ethics, a work not surpassed in penetration and cogent reasoning by any before or since his day.

The school was crowded with scholars. For thirteen years, the daily spectacle of a large gathering of studious men was presented to the people of Athens. These could be seen moving about in groups, from about ten o'clock in the morning until well into the afternoon, Aristotle moving among them, now declaiming, now arguing, but always teaching. Such earnest inquiry, such incessant application to study could not fail to bring important results.

With the breaking up of the Macedonian empire, the Athenians, moved by the eloquence of Demosthenes, sought to regain their independence. Aristotle was known to be in sympathy with the fortunes of Alexander and the Macedonian rulers that succeeded him, and so Aristotle fled from Athens to Chalcis, where he died, B. C. 322, at the age of 65.

The mantle of Aristotle fell upon his foremost

pupil in the Peripatetic school, one Theophrastus. His writings, the most of which had been written by his own hand, were likewise bequeathed to this scholar. Upon the death of Theophrastus the works and manuscripts of Aristotle passed into the possession of Neleus, a teacher in the Peripatetic school, who shortly thereafter moved from Athens to Asia Minor, and the whole collection of Aristotle's works was soon thereafter concealed in a vault, for it appears that the king of Pergamus was at the time levying contributions for a library, and Neleus hid the writings of Aristotle, fearing lest the king should take them. Neleus died, and the place of concealment of the writings was unknown, so that the works remained thus hidden from the knowledge of men until they were discovered one hundred and eighty-seven years later, or about the year B. C. 100. And now the entire collection was sold to a book collector, who carried the works back to Athens. Thus, after an absence of two hundred years the manuscripts came back to the place of their birth. When Sulla sacked Athens in B. C. 86, the works of Aristotle were discovered and taken to Rome, where, under the direction of Cicero, the manuscripts were arranged in proper order and an edition compiled by competent Greek scholars. This work was done about B. C. 50.

We can readily understand and appreciate the embarrassment to the Peripatetic school, which the prolonged loss of the works of its founder

occasioned. Generations came and passed away, but Peripateticism survived the long interval and kept the lamp of Aristotelian philosophy burning in all the intellectual centers of Greece. It must be observed, however, that the school was greatly shorn of its rich and virile activity, for during this period of two centuries the schools of the Stoics and the Epicureans were developed and these appropriated much that the earlier Peripatetics had taught. So, for a time, the work of the Peripatetics was more by way of interpreting the works and conceptions of their master, than in applying and teaching those doctrines which, two centuries earlier, had stirred the minds of men profoundly. The school revived somewhat with the recovery of the works of Aristotle and embraced the best scholarship of Greece from B. C. 100 to A. D. 200. This is especially true of the Peripatetic conceptions of logic and ethics. The Greek theologians of the first centuries of our era were profoundly impressed by the logic and force of Peripateticism, and those who were charged with heresy and anathematized by councils, frequently embraced the doctrines of Aristotle and became avowed Peripatetics.

We have now come with Peripateticism to the place in history where all the schools of Greece met their tragic end, to the all absorbing contest waged between the two great giants of that age, —Neo-Platonism and Christianity.

We find such leaders in the school of Neo-Pla-

tonism as Porphyry, A. D. 280, and Iamblichus, A. D. 330, embracing Aristotelian doctrine and preaching its maxims in the true Peripatetic manner. And so, under the form of Neo-Platonism, we follow our great teacher and author, until we hear of the assassination of Hypatia, the celebrated Neo-Platonist teacher, and the closing of the renowned school at Alexandria over which she had presided, followed by the closing of the school at Athens and the suppression of all the schools by the emperor, Justinian, at the behest of Christian bishops.

Christianity, with its in-graftings of mysticism and superstition, now stands alone,—the conqueror of all the schools of philosophy, the vanquisher of all liberal learning everywhere throughout the Roman empire. Ignorance and superstition now begin in all Europe their dark reign, which held men in thraldom for nearly a thousand years.

It were easy now to draw the curtain across the stage and leave Peripateticism, struck down in the general slaughter of the schools, to remain until the resurrection period, which came, nine centuries later, with the Renaissance. But we can discern the lamp moving on, lighting a devious path through a well defined period of the world's history, which we will follow.

Hypatia was assassinated in the year 415, through the influence of St. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria. The council of Ephesus was held A. D. 431. The dominating figure and spirit in that

council was this same assassin, St. Cyril. At this council the proposition to worship the Virgin Mary was advocated by St. Cyril and the Greek bishops of Africa, and opposed by the Greek Patriarch, Nestorius, who occupied the Episcopal throne of Constantinople. By fraud, Nestorius and his followers were defeated in the council and soon thereafter Nestorius was banished to Arabia. Nestorius was a learned man in all the philosophy of the Greek schools and had a profound conviction of the truth of the doctrines of the Peripatetics. He was joined in exile by a large following, who held his religious views, and these settled at Edessa and established a college there. They were known as "Nestorians;" this was in A. D. 432. The college at Edessa taught Nestorian Christianity and Aristotelian logic and ethics. The school soon became crowded. There had remained in Arabia and Persia a lingering and ineffaceable residue of Greek civilization, art, and letters from the time when these states were a part of the Macedonian empire, so the work of the new school at Edessa was a revival of Greek letters and philosophy in those states, rather than the introduction there of these studies. The doctrines of the Peripatetics, however, were new to the Arabians and Persians. The renown of this school gave to Edessa the name of "the Athens of Syria," and soon awoke the jealousy of the Christian Church at Constantinople, and Emperor Zeno drove from Edessa the Nestorians and their

school in A. D. 489. The outrage did not dishearten the Nestorians, for they felt that they had a mission to perform, so they removed to Persia and established a school at Nisibis, also one at Nisabur. Here, too, the schools flourished and translations of Aristotle were made into the Syriac. And so Peripateticism flourished on Persian soil, as it had flourished centuries earlier in Greece. The popularity of these schools finally led the Nestorians to establish a college at Bagdad. This city was the caliphate of Islam at that time and was famous for its commerce, its learning and its religious influences. Mohammedanism was centered at Bagdad. The Nestorian institution soon assumed the proportions and importance of a university. It held steadily to the doctrines of the Peripatetics and in the ninth century translated the works of Aristotle into Arabic. This was a most important work and of far-reaching effect. It brought the study of the greatest of the Greek philosophers before the Moslem scholars of that remote city and country, and these became enthusiastic exponents of Peripateticism. A young Arabian who had just graduated from this school stated, in a public address, on the subject of Aristotle's works and philosophy: "The doctrine is fixed, truth has been ascertained; all we need is a faithful interpretation."

While all Christendom was asleep in the darkness of ignorance and superstition; when Europe

was sunk well nigh to the verge of barbarism, borne down by the prolonged and incessant weight of the cross; when philosophy and liberal learning had vanished, and while only such arts as the Church could use,—architecture, painting and music,—were lingering languidly, there were developing in Mohammedan Arabia splendid scholars and philosophers, men familiar with the works of Aristotle and with the maxims of the Peripatetics of the third century B. C.

Now, what was the fruit of all these centuries of growth and bloom of this exotic plant in Asia? From Bagdad the doctrines of the Peripatetics and the full-grown philosophy of Aristotle burst in a flood of light, at the Court of the Saracens in Cordova, in the closing years of the tenth century. We should remember that it was in a city of Mohammedan Spain that the first school in Europe for the study of Aristotle, and the first observatory for the study of astronomy, were established. Soon the schools, or colleges, in Cordova reached to twenty-seven in number and a splendid library was established; books from Bagdad, Cairo, Damascus and Alexandria were gathered and brought to Cordova.

Passing on, we soon see coming forth from the schools of Cordova, a new exponent of Aristotle and a worthy expounder of Peripatetic doctrines in the person of Averroes. This Mohammedan electrified Europe with his interpretations of Aristotelian philosophy, with his original investiga-

tions in the natural sciences and his opinions derived therefrom.

A group of Jewish scholars, that the Christians had driven out of Spain, located at Narbonne, translated the works of Averroes and the Arabian translations of Aristotle, into Latin. These works had a lively and profound influence on the "Schoolmen," for it must be borne in mind that the schoolmen of Europe inherited Arabian philosophy from the Saracens of Spain and that they got their Aristotle from Averroes in 1198. An historian states this clearly: "Averroes was the greatest interpreter of Aristotle to the later schoolmen and worthy a place beside the sages of ancient Greece." This philosophy, or ethics, fell on unfriendly ground, however, for scholasticism was bound to the Church and had no independent existence aside from it. It was quite otherwise with that other body of scholars, developing at this time,—the Humanists. These were opposed to having moral ideals debased by the corruption and corrupting influences then pertaining to, if not inherent in, the Christian religion, and eagerly sought, and appropriated, the morality of Aristotle, which, as we shall see presently, is based on reason and not on piety. This splendid group of scholars was now moved by an urgent desire to the study of Greek classics and, strange as it may appear, the study of Greek had well nigh perished from the earth, save that remnant of the ancient language which was

preserved in Arabia, and that which was preserved by the patriarchs of the Greek Church at Constantinople. This was all that was then known to exist. Petrarch had employed a monk of the Greek Church to read and translate to him, orally, the works of Aristotle, and Boccaccio had followed a similar course. The light that had been lit at Cordova now shone over the intellectual centers of Europe and an insatiable thirst for Aristotle, and the works of the old Greek schools, was now consuming the humanists. It was surmised that vast treasures, writings of the philosophers of Greece, had been stored away in vaults at Constantinople, so an association of the humanists appointed delegates to go to Constantinople and, if possible, secure the aid of the patriarch of the Greek Church to assist them in making a search for the lost or hidden manuscripts and books of the ancient Greek scholars and philosophers. This work was undertaken with real enthusiam and met with a measure of success. "I go," said Cyriac of Anconia, "I go to raise the dead!" Cyriac was successful to a considerable extent. He secured many manuscripts of value, but he did not raise the dead. However, he did raise the Holy Inquisition, which was much worse.

With the revival of the study of Aristotle and the independent opinions now expressed by the humanists, the Church began to thunder its wonted disapproval, for the humanists took for their models the great men of antiquity, rather

than the saints of the Church. It is admitted that Peripatetic studies, at this time, became the source of heresies and that the heretical sects prosecuted the study of Aristotle with renewed vigor and zeal. As the schoolmen had inherited Arabian philosophy from the Saracens of Spain, who had drawn their Aristotle and Peripateticism from Averroes, the deflection among the schoolmen from established Christianity was directly traceable to these doctrines, and pursuant to this fact the Church, in council, at Paris, A. D. 1209, forbade the study of Aristotle's works, and, in 1215, reiterated this prohibition and included the works of Averroes.

It would be interesting to follow the able dissenters from the established opinions of the Church, that arose at about this time, growing out of the study of Aristotle. Abelard was the center of this group in the twelfth century. Opposed to Abelard and his party was the able and famous Thomas Aquinas, who sought to subordinate all science to conform with Roman Catholic Christianity. Aquinas comprehended, admired, and became a patron of the doctrines of Aristotle, but in the controversy which arose united his influence, and heart, with the Church, thus subordinating reason to faith.

We can follow the doctrines and the interpretations of Averroes through the scholasticism of the latter schoolmen, through the splendid works of the classical humanists into the wide and all power-

ful rebirth of learning in Europe which we call the Renaissance. This influence contributed to and made possible, if not necessary, the great movement in Germany, which culminated in the Reformation, and with it a return by many to the simple and informal manner of worship of the primitive Christians.

Martin Luther, however, appears not to have been conscious of the fact that the Reformation was in any way a sequence of the study of Aristotle, which had, for two centuries preceding, prepared the minds of men for emancipation from the corrupt and licentious domination of them by the Church of Rome. Luther bursts forth in condemnation of Peripateticism and the schools: "Aristotle, that histrionic mountebank, who, from behind a Greek mask, has so long bewitched the Church of Christ; that most cunning juggler of souls, whom, if he had not been accredited as of human blood and bone, we should have been justified in maintaining to be the veritable devil."

Another contributing cause to the "Re-birth" was the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 and the release to the world of a vast amount of the Greek literature of the old masters.

Humanity and civilization owe much to Peripateticism; and humanity and civilization owe much to Arabian philosophy, and to Moslem scholars, for giving back to Europe, and the world, the great works of the Greek schools, which Christian-

ity had suppressed in the fourth and fifth centuries. And now what had Christianity given the world in precept and example better than the sturdy morality and probity of the Stoics and Peripatetics? For a thousand years the Church had in all Europe enjoyed possession of unlimited power. It had crowned and sceptred kings and through them governed nations and controlled the bodies and lives of men. It held the keys of St. Peter and at pleasure bound or loosed the souls of men and women through eternity. At the beginning of the Renaissance militant Christianity in Italy came to flower (!) in princes like Machiavelli, Galeazzo M. Sforza, Gianpaolo Baglioni and the Medici, and in Pontiffs and church dignitaries such as Pope Paul III., Sixtus IV., Alexander VI., and Cæsar Borgia, men who—or many of whom—found their ideals and activities chiefly in carnal pleasures, incestuous lust, fratricide and parricide.

At this time, the Church was terrified and infuriated by the progress of reforms. To be a scholar was to be suspected by the Church of immorality, of heresy and atheism, and these were frequently included in one indictment. So it appears, that the scholars of this era became involved with the Church, and persecutions and prosecutions were dealt out against them, with more bitterness, and with less justification, than the prosecutions of the Christians had been carried on by the emperors; for where the emperors of Rome

had executed thousands, the Church now killed off its tens of thousands. The comparison is favorable to the Roman magistrates also from the fact that they did not go beyond the requirements of the law, except in the persecutions under Nero, which, while not numerous, and while confined to the city, still were without due process of law.

The system of worship in Rome, at the beginning of our era and for long before, was protected by law. Even the building of the Pantheon at Rome by Agrippa, B. C. 25, did not bring about a repeal of the laws governing public worship. Let us examine a number of cases of martyrdom which came about pursuant to law, and these may be taken as a sample of all. The early Christians were pleased to call all prosecutions of them "persecutions." We shall begin with the unjust, but celebrated case of the philosopher Socrates. At this time, B. C. 399, the court of the Areopagus considered cases, which came under the heads of jurisprudence, politics and religion. The form of indictment against Socrates, which has come down to us through Xenophon, was this: "Socrates behaves wrongfully, in not acknowledging those as gods whom the state holds to be gods, and in introducing new gods of his own; he acts wrongfully also in corrupting the youth." Forty years earlier a similar indictment for atheism had been brought against Anaxagoras, preceptor of Socrates. This early scholar, and doubter, held

to belief in the primary principles of monotheism and opposed his opinions to those of Homer, as expressed in the Iliad, which are polytheistic and from which the state religion of Greece had been evolved. It required all the resources and prestige of Pericles to save him from martyrdom. This indictment of Socrates was brought by members of the school, or profession, of Sophists, a class which Socrates had often criticised for their insincerity and corruption. "Am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" rejoins Socrates who appeared before the jury in his own defense. This defense reveals much that is pertinent to our subject. I quote from Plato's Apology. "I should have done what was decidedly wrong, O Athenians, if, when the Archons whom you elected ordered me, at Potidæa, at Delium and at Amphipolis to accept the post given me in the war, and stand where I was ordered, to stand at the risk of death; if then, I say, I had not obeyed the command, and exposed my life willingly for the good of my country; but when the order came from a god, as I had the best reason to believe that a god did order me to spend my life philosophizing, and in proving myself and others, whether we were living according to right reason; if in such circumstances I should now, from fear of death, or from any other motive, leave my post, and become a deserter, this were indeed a sin. . . . If, notwithstanding this declaration of my prosecutor, you should still be unconvinced,

and say,—O Socrates, for the present we discharge you but on this condition, that for the future you shall not go on philosophizing and proving, as you have hitherto done; and, if you are caught doing so, then you shall die,—if on these conditions you are now willing to acquit me I should say to you,—O Athenians, that, while I cherish all loyal respect and love for you, I choose to obey the gods rather than men, and so long as I live and breathe, I will never cease philosophizing and exhorting any of you with whom I may happen to converse, and addressing him as I have been wont, thus,—O my excellent fellow citizen of a state the most famous for wisdom and for resources, is it seemly in you to feel no shame if, while you are spending your strength in the accumulation of money, and in the acquisition of civic reputation, you bestow not the slightest pains to have your soul as well furnished with intelligence as your life is with prosperity? . . . And in this wise I will speak to every man whom I shall converse with, be he citizen, or be he stranger, and the rather if he be a fellow citizen to whom I am bound by nearer and more indissoluble ties. For this is precisely what I am commanded to do by the god; and if the god did indeed give forth this command, then must I distinctly declare that no greater blessing could be to this city than that, so long as I do live, I shall live to execute the divine command. . . . But it perhaps may seem strange to some one,

that, while I go about the city giving counsel to every man in this busy fashion, with all my fondness for business I have not found my way into public life, nor come forward on this stage to advise you on public affairs. Now the cause of this is none other than that which you have frequently heard me mention, namely, that something divine and superhuman to which Meletus in his address scoffingly alluded; for this is the sober truth, O ye judges, that from my boyhood I have, on all important occasions, been wont to hear a voice which, whenever it speaks in reference to what I am about to do, always warns me to refrain, but never urges me to perform. This voice it is and nothing else, which forbade me to meddle with public affairs, and forbade me very wisely, as I can now clearly perceive, and with a most excellent result; for of this, O Athenians, be assured, if I had essayed at an early period of my life to manage your public business, I should without doubt have perished long ago and done no good either to you or to myself. And be not wroth with me if in this I tell you the truth; the man does not exist who shall be able to save his life anywhere, if he shall set himself honestly and persistently to oppose you or any other multitude of people when you are violently bent on doing things unjust and unlawful; whosoever, therefore, would live on this earth as the champion of right and justice, if only for a little while, amongst men, must make up his mind to do good as a private

person and forego all ambition to serve the public in a political capacity."

On the eve of his execution he said to some friends: "Well, friends, we have been discoursing for this last hour on the immortality of the soul, and there are many points about that matter on which he were a bold man who should readily dogmatize; but one thing I seem to know full certainly, that whosoever during his earthly life has flung sensual pleasures behind him, and been studious to adorn his soul, not with conventional and adventitious trappings, but with its own proper decorations,—temperance and justice, courage, freedom, and truth—the person so prepared waits cheerfully to perform the journey to the unseen world at whatever period Fate may choose to call him."

Socrates might have saved himself by paying a fine and by giving some assurances that he would modify his outspoken attitude towards the forms of public worship, but he would have vindication, or death, and so, this great man of antiquity was brought to martyrdom, but not, however, until the court had given a month's delay and had proposed many concessions. Sad and unfortunate, as this case appears to be, yet the venerated court on Mars' Hill considered the indictment and gave its judgment.

In the year 175 B. C., occurred the martyrdom of the Maccabees; over a thousand Jews suffered by fire and smoke, pursuant to a decree of Anti-

ochus Epiphanes, a Macedonian king, or rather, king of the principality of Syria, for by this time the Macedonian empire had been divided into three principalities. The full account of these uncalled for and unfortunate persecutions may be found in the First and Second "Maccabees,"—Apocryphal books of the Old Testament,—but I shall draw from the account given of them by Josephus.

Upon the death of Onias, the High Priest, the high priesthood fell to his brother Jesus,[8]—and much dissatisfaction then arose. This disturbance came up for consideration by the king at Antioch, and he deemed it best, for the tranquillity of his kingdom, that Jesus should be deposed from the high office, and that a younger brother named Menelaus, should be appointed in his place, and this was soon brought about by the order of Antiochus. Upon this event a sedition broke out among the Jews at Jerusalem, which was led by the deposed High Priest—Jesus, and it appears that the influential class followed the deposed Jesus, that the sedition spread over all Judea and assumed the importance of a rebellion against the king and the government. The king now appears to have been greatly distressed over the un-

[8] "Jesus" was a common name with the Jews. There was one High Priest by this name among the Asmonean families and four among the Idumaean. There were two High Priests by this name shortly before the coming of Jesus of Nazareth. The unspeakable Herod, the King and Idumaean, brought an end to the Asmonean kings and priests by assassinating them.

settled state of the Jews and finally determined to press the worship, and the gods, of Greece upon the Jews to the end, as he affirmed in his decree, that the form of worship of all his subjects might be uniform. This was a very serious undertaking, and a more astute king would not have attempted it. From what Josephus states, it is not clear whether Antiochus was sincere in the declarations of the purpose of his decree, to bring about a uniformity of public worship throughout his principality, or whether it was a pretext for a general persecution of the Jews.

It appears that the High Priest Menelaus, and all the Jews that followed him, complied with the king's decree, threw over the worship of Jehovah and accepted the gods of Greece. The Samaritan Jews went even farther. They converted their splendid temple on Mount Gerizzim, which had been built for them by Sanballat, at the request of his son-in-law, Manasseh, brother to the High Priest Jaddua, which had been dedicated to the worship of Jehovah, the God of the Jews, into a temple for the worship of the gods of Greece; disowned their country, denied their nationality, bowed down before, and paid divine honors to Antiochus, all for repose and the pursuit of wealth. Their petition to the king, upon the breaking out of the persecution, runs thus: "To King Antiochus the God, a memorial from the Sidonians, who live at Shechem: Our forefathers, upon certain frequent plagues, and as following

a certain ancient superstition, had a custom of observing that day which by the Jews (!) is called the Sabbath. And when they had erected a temple at the Mount called Gerizzim, though without a name, they offered upon it the proper sacrifices. Now upon the just treatment of these wicked Jews, those that manage their affairs, supposing that we were of kin to them, and practiced as they do, make us liable to the same accusations, although we are originally Sidonians, as is evident from the public records. We therefore beseech thee, our benefactor and Savior, to give orders to Apollonius, the governor of this part of the country, and to Nicanor, the procurator of thy affairs, to give us no disturbance, nor to lay to our charge what the Jews are accused of, since we are aliens from their nation, and from their customs; but let our temple, which at present hath no name at all, be named the Temple of Jupiter Hellenius. If this were done, we should be no longer disturbed, but should be more intent on our own occupation with quietness, and so bring in a greater revenue to thee."

This gem of duplicity is without a parallel in history. It brought relief, however, to the Samaritan Jews and served its purpose well.

The followers of the deposed High Priest, Jesus, included the numerous and renowned family of the Maccabees. These were descended from the Asmoneans,—a family which ruled over the Jews for about one hundred and thirty years and whose

ascendency was continued down to about 37 B. C. The wife of Herod the Great, Meriamme, was a direct descendant of the Asmoneans and as well of the Maccabees. The Maccabees remained faithful to the traditions and laws of their forefathers and declined to comply with the king's decree. They led in this opposition and it was from this family, or tribe, that over a thousand members suffered martyrdom.

After all persuasion had failed, and the persecution of the Maccabees had availed nothing, Antiochus entered Jerusalem with a great army and began a systematic persecution of the Jews in their ancient stronghold and before their venerated temple. Josephus describes this event.

"And King Antiochus sacked Jerusalem and robbed and desecrated the temple, and when he had overthrown the city walls, he built a citadel in the lower part of the city, for the place was high, and overlooked the temple, on which account he fortified it with high walls and towers and put into it a garrison of Macedonians. . . . And when the king had built an Idol altar upon God's altar, he slew swine upon it, and so offered a sacrifice neither according to the law, nor the Jewish religious worship. . . . He also compelled them to forsake the worship which they paid their own God and to adore those whom he took to be gods, and made them build temples, and raise Idol altars in every city and village and offer swine upon them every day. He also commanded them

not to circumcise their sons, and threatened to punish any that should be found to have transgressed his injunction. . . . The best men and noblest souls were disobedient and on which account they every day underwent great miseries and bitter torments, for they were whipped with rods, and their bodies were torn to pieces, and were crucified while they were still alive and breathed; they also strangled those women, and their sons whom they had circumcised, as the king had appointed hanging their sons upon their necks as they were upon the cross."

The Jews now took up arms and were led by the Asmonean, Mattathias Maccabeus, and while the war was in progress, Antiochus died and was succeeded by his son, Antiochus Eupator, who continued the war and the persecutions for a short period but finally desisted. The Jews soon gathered themselves together and purified the temple at Jerusalem and appointed Judas Maccabeus, brother of Mattathias, their High Priest, and continued to worship Jehovah and to live according to the laws of Moses.

This persecution was exceedingly unjust, though it was carried on pursuant to the king's decree, which in that age and with the Macedonian kings, was law.

Mani, a prophet and founder of the Manichæan cult, one of the great Aryan religions, and one that influenced and modified Christianity in the third, fourth and fifth centuries, was tried

before King Bahram I., on an indictment brought by the Magian priests, and was condemned for the crime of atheism (disbelief in the gods of another cult of which these priests were the militant representatives) and was crucified at Ctesiphon A. D. 276. His disciples in Persia were persecuted and dispersed, many suffering martyrdom.

The Martyrdom of John the Baptist, by order of Herod, was apparently without other authority than that possessed by a Tetrarch.

James, the brother of Jesus, was soon thereafter condemned by the Sanhedrin, presided over at that time by the Sadducee High Priest, Ananus. This judgment was not acquiesced in by the procurator, Albinus, and Agrippa caused Ananus to be deprived of the office of High Priest.

Of Jesus, it is not necessary to make mention, except to say that the procurator, Pontius Pilate, assented to the decree of the Sanhedrin and that He was crucified pursuant thereto.

Stephen, one of the first seven deacons of the Nazarene Church, appointed by the Apostles, was condemned by the Sanhedrin and executed A. D. 37. The judgment of the Sanhedrin appears not to have been approved or taken notice of by the procurator. This fact may well justify the doubt that Stephen was tried before the Sanhedrin.

St. Polycarp suffered martyrdom under Trajan in February A. D. 155. The proconsul at Smyrna, before whom he was tried, whose name

was Quadratus, used every endeavor within his power to save him. Polycarp could have made it possible and easy for the magistrate to save him, but he would make no concessions to his accusers. The hearing was adjourned by the proconsul, that he might personally labor with the accused, to induce him to make such concessions as would prevent a verdict of death. Polycarp acted as one courting death, rather than one who would escape it.

Christians were arraigned under Emperor Antoninus Pius on such charges as these: that they were atheists; that they were rebels against the Roman government; that they were evil doers; that they were faithless to the gods, to the emperor and to society. Justin Martyr, a Greek philosopher of the Peripatetic school, and convert to Christianity, suffered martyrdom in A. D. 165. In his "apology" which was addressed to Emperor Pius, he says: "Judge us by a scrupulous and enlightened equity, not by mere presumption, nor in the name of superstition, nor by the persuasion of calumny. We are atheists if it is atheism not to acknowledge your gods, but we hold this glorious atheism in common with Socrates, who was martyred as we are. We are not rebels; the kingdom founded by Jesus is purely spiritual and need be no cause of alarm to the emperors. We worship God only, but we joyfully obey and acknowledge you as our prince and governor. We are not criminals; the cruci-

fied one, whom we worship, is the Divine Word." Justin appears to have been tried before "Rusticus, a Roman magistrate, who was a Stoic." He professed his faith in the "God of Heaven and Earth," and in "His son the Master of Truth," and expressed the conviction that after death he would "share a blessed immortality." He was then executed.

When St. Cyprian was condemned to martyrdom, the decree of the magistrate was withheld for three days, and Cyprian was importuned by the officer to concede something, that the magistrate might let him go free, but Cyprian would make no concessions. The decree was finally entered: "That Thascius Cyprianus should be immediately beheaded, as the enemy of the gods of Rome and as the chief and ringleader of a criminal association, which he has seduced into an impious resistance against the laws of the most holy emperors—Valerian and Gallienus." It is further related that when the decree was read, the multitude of Christians present sent up the shout:—"And we will die with him." Cyprian heard the verdict with composure, and when led to execution, bequeathed his money and the valuables that were on his person to his executioners.

After persecuting the Christians for six years, Galerius gave up the effort. His decree has been preserved to us and is interesting, for it discloses the character of the mind of the emperor and gives

us an insight into relationships and associations existing in Rome at that time. The persecutions of Christians under Galerius were according to the forms of law. The decree: "Among the important cares which have occupied our mind for the utility and preservation of the empire, it was our intention to correct and re-establish all things according to the ancient laws and public discipline of the Romans. We were particularly desirous of reclaiming into the way of reason and nature, the deluded Christians, who had renounced the religion and ceremonies instituted by their fathers; and presumptively despising the practice of antiquity, had invented extravagant laws and opinions according to the dictates of their fancy, and had collected a various society from the different provinces of our empire. The edicts, which we have published to enforce the worship of the gods, having exposed many of the Christians to danger and distress; many having suffered death, and many more, who still persist in their impious folly, being left destitute of any exercise of religion, we are disposed to extend to those unhappy men the effects of our wonted clemency. We permit them, therefore, freely to profess their private opinions, and to assemble in their conventicles without fear or molestation, provided always that they preserve due respect to the established laws and government.

"By another rescript we shall signify our intention to the judges and magistrates; and we

hope that our indulgence will engage the Christians to offer up their prayers to the Deity whom they adore, for our safety and prosperity, for their own, and for that of the republic."

With the emperors, then, we find that the prosecution of Christians followed violation of the laws of Rome. How was it with the Christian Church?

Hypatia was the first martyr to Christian hate. Her school of Platonism was both influential and popular; the Christian Church at Alexandria was jealous and resentful, and so the bishop and his suffragans brought about her martyrdom without process of law.

Bruno was burnt in Rome by the Church because he believed, with Copernicus, that there are other worlds than this, and that the Church's conception of an anthropomorphous God of the universe was preposterous. The revelations of astronomy were in conflict with the revelations of scripture; hence astronomers were heretics and should be burnt alive. Celsus, in the second century, had said: "Faith is the ability or power which enables one to say that he believes a thing which is incredible." To recant, one must have the opposite disposition of mind and deny a proposition which he had affirmed and which he knows to be true. Bruno would not do this. In the galaxy of adored Christian martyrs there is not a name as bright and glorious as that of this

unchristian martyr; not one saint who had evinced a more exalted regard for truth, not one who gave up as much for principle. The Christian martyr saw heaven, Jesus and an eternity of happiness before him, and behind was apotheosis. For Bruno there was no paradise awaiting, and behind no "storied urn or animated bust." The Christians suffered martyrdom for reward, Bruno for honor. The execution of this splendid man appears to have been without other process of law than the ecclesiastical court of the Inquisition.

Then, there was the martyrdom of Servetus at Geneva. Calvin and Calvinism were the authors of this crime. Servetus had said that the genuine doctrines of Christianity had been lost before the day of the Nicene council. Porphyry had made a similar criticism in the third century. At the time Servetus was burnt in Geneva, there was no civil law prescribing capital punishment in all Switzerland.

John Huss had said that Christ, not Peter, is the head of the Church. For this, the council of Constance decreed that he be burnt alive. This verdict, and that other one rendered a few days later, consigning Jerome of Prague to the flames for criticising the acts of the council in the case of Huss, appear to have been approved by the emperor, for he was in attendance at the council and cognizant of the trials of these men. If the verdict was lawful, it is upon the theory, ap-

proved by fools, that "the king can do no wrong."

The martyrdom of Savonarola and his two friends and fellow workers, at Florence, in 1496, are worthy of notice. Savonarola was an exceptionally able man; he was a great preacher, a great teacher, a reformer and a statesman. His morality was drawn from the ethical philosophy of Aristotle and was sanctified by the best precepts of Jesus. He had inherited a love of the classics from the humanists and had consecrated all to the work of the ministry. His only crime was that he opposed the luxury and extravagance of Lorenzo de Medici, the ruler of Florence, declaimed against the corruption and immorality of Pope Alexander, and declared that there should be agreement between the acts and the professions of men. So it was resolved at Rome that Savonarola should be sacrificed, for having thus made severe criticism of the morals of His Holiness, the Vicar of Christ. When Alexander was cautioned, by his advisers at Florence, that the procedure was not without danger, he replied: "He shall die even though he were a second John the Baptist." And so, after long torture, Savonarola and his co-laborers, Girolamo and Domenico, were consigned to the flames. As far as I can ascertain, the procedure was without process of law. So with three dissenters from the established creed, touching the trinity, who suffered martyrdom in England in 1611. The condemnation and execution of these can hardly

be said to have been according to the spirit, or the form, of Anglo-Saxon law.

We may consider here another class of executions by the Church. If the total martyrdoms of early Christians under the emperors were, as many historians state, about 6000, and those executions were performed pursuant to judicial procedure, what shall we say of the institution created in the name of Jesus and early presided over by that zealous but infamous churchman, Torquemada, which tortured to the verge of death over 300,000 dissenters and actually killed 32,000 victims during its career? What of the massacre of 40,000 Huguenots in Paris on St. Bartholomew's day, inspired by the Church? What of the thousands massacred at the Sicilian Vespers, at Avignon and Languedoc? We may pause to ask: Shall we judge a tree by its fruit? Shall we judge a doctrine by its exponents? Yes; but we should first examine well, and ascertain, if the exponents are in all things consistent with the profession they make. We should give credit and honor to those who have given comfort, support and ideals to men in the name of Him who said: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." But we should, as well, condemn those who opposed, oppressed and persecuted men for opinion's sake, however holy may have been, or may be, the insignia of their office.

But to return to the Ethics of Aristotle. In

doing so we must make some comparisons, or rather contrast his doctrines briefly with three other schools, for Aristotle did not teach by precepts or express himself in axioms, and it is only with some difficulty that his views can be presented briefly and clearly.

John Stuart Blackie, D. D., in his celebrated work on Ethics, refers to Aristotle thus: "The reputation which Aristotle maintained among ancient Greeks and Romans, both as a speculator and as a wise guide in the conduct of life, was increased rather than diminished when brought into contact with the new moral force of Christianity. No doubt, Plato, at first, was the natural vestibule through which the cultivated Greeks of Alexandria entered the Temple of Christian faith, but after that faith, partly in league with Plato, and partly in spite of Plato, had achieved its natural triumph, Aristotle, the clean cut, and keen, but by no means devout master of all knowledge, by a sort of a reaction, as it should appear, in the middle ages, began to assert an exclusive dominance in the schools. . . . To all who were anxious for clear and exact knowledge in matters visible and tangible, Aristotle was the only guide." This is a very fair statement of the case, coming from a Christian theologian.

Socrates was the father of moral philosophy and Plato may be said to be in accord with Socrates. Aristotle, while agreeing with these

on several important points, had a method of considering propositions altogether different. These three great thinkers comprise the group known as the Athenian Philosophers.

Plato constructed theories and propositions.

Aristotle dissected propositions and classified their elements.

Plato stands for Idealism.

Aristotle, for Realism.

The method of Plato was synthetic; that of Aristotle was analytic. "The intellect of Plato was a garden of Paradise; that of Aristotle a granite palace. Aristotle's wit was like a sharp knife and a weighty hammer; Plato's like a rolling river and a shining ocean. The one bristled with all curious knowledge, the other blossomed with all lofty speculation; Aristotle analyzed all things great and small; Plato harmonized all things beautiful and grand."

Plato speaks of Purgatory, Heaven and Hell.

Aristotle mentions none of these and it does not appear that he believed in a conscious continuity of life after the dissolution of this body.

Plato glorified Reason above all our attributes and personified it as "the Logos."

Aristotle builds his system of ethics on reason and extols it above all other characteristics of man. "Man is a social animal; the normal conception of man is of man in a state of civilization, and this implies the conception of a state." What is the chief good? "The chief end of any

creature is to find his place in the world; where he will find joy in living and doing." We must discern the differentiating elements in the human creature. "The differentiating element in birds is wings; in fish, fins; in worms, rings; in man, Reason; hence it is from nature that we learn that man is above all a reasoning animal and that he should live by employing this faculty. Therefore a life lived according to reason will attain the chief good." From this it appears that Aristotle finds what is the duty of man by first discovering the chief and distinctive faculty in man and bids us follow that, for in doing so, we but fulfill our destiny, which nature has prescribed to man and in this we attain the "chief good."

"A right action is an action according to the constitution of things; a wrong action is an action in contravention of the constitution of things." Aristotle laid down but one maxim, but that one is eminently practical and full of common sense: "Virtue, or right conduct is generally found in the mean between two extremes." Or as applied to propositions: "Truth is to be found midway between the extremes of a given contention."

Solomon appears to have anticipated this aphorism of Aristotle:

"Be not righteous overmuch, neither make thyself overwise; why shouldst thou destroy thyself? Be not overmuch wicked, neither be thou

foolish; why shouldst thou die before thy time?"

Courage is thus found to be a mean between cowardice and rashness, and in the case of truth, even after it has been found by pursuing it, after the formula given, the rule will also apply to the quantity of truth which society can receive and assimilate.

"A surplus of truth," says a disciple of Aristotle, "is sure to make society uncomfortable and a deluge of it makes it impossible. Hence in the conduct of life the great importance of not speaking too much truth lest we frighten people, and not speaking too little lest we learn altogether to live upon lies."

Self esteem is a mean between self glorification and self debasement. "The unhealthy condition of body and soul," says an expositor of Aristotle, "is chiefly indicated by some deficiency or excess," and "Virtue is a medium, a balance, a proportion, a symmetry, a harmony, a nice adjustment of the forces of each part in reference to the calculated action of the whole." Not only in human affairs is this law operative, but in the physical universe as well. The orbit of a planet is but the mean determined by the operation of two opposing forces. In chemistry, the compound is the result of two, or more, opposing properties, having affinity for one another, losing their identity and characteristics in union. The mean is discerned in numbers and in mathematics, also it is seen in the course of values on

the world's exchanges; in commerce, when commodities are extremely high, sell; when abnormally cheap, buy. In government, when conditions have become insupportable; when the greatest good for the greatest number has long been ignored, and the righteous indignation of democracy bursts forth in revolution; when the horrors of civil war are upon us,—then let us pause, for we shall find peace and equity midway between the extremes of oppression and revolution. And so it is as Aristotle has well said: "We go to war that me may have peace."

Aristotle approaches the consideration of the nature of the soul cautiously. "It will be necessary in discussing the soul," he says, "to define which of the categories it belongs to, whether it is potentiality or actuality." As he affirms immortality of the "Active Reason" and the "Active Mind," we may infer, I think, that these qualities, or attributes, are synonymous with the soul. Peripateticism affirms that "the soul is the harmony of the body," that its functions are "modes of motion" and that, "reason and the faculties of sense-perception are at one." As Aristotle everywhere affirms Reason and Matter, Averroes interprets him as having believed that man is compounded of "Reason and Matter" (soul and body) and that as the body of man is gathered from the vast store of matter in nature and its final restoration made to that store, so is the emanation of the soul of man ("the Active Rea-

son") from the Universal Intellect, finally reabsorbed by the Universal Intellect or Deity.

In an immortality of this character, individuality and self-consciousness are lost. There is here, however, an ennobling thought and an inspiring conception. It supports the assumption that we are, in something more than a figurative sense, and to a degree at least,—the Sons of God. There is no more specific assumption of the immortality of the soul than this. He keeps far from anything which might be termed "faith." He speaks of the gods frequently, but never with warmth or with sentiments of love and affection; with him devotion is the child of emotional life. As to the formation of the world, he would attribute it to the operation of natural forces, rather than to the effort of a transcendent Deity.

Aristotle believed in learning by doing. He approaches an inquiry into the subject of virtue in this manner: "We will now inquire into the nature of virtue, not only that we may come to know what virtue is, but rather that we may be virtuous," and he argues that "excellence grows by the contemplation of high ideals." On the subject of "Happiness" as the end of human action, this from the "Nicomachean Ethics": . . . "If happiness be an energy according to virtue, it is reasonable to suppose that it is according to the best virtue; and this must be the virtue of the best part of man.

Whether, then, this best part be the intellect, or something else—which is thought naturally to bear rule and to govern, and to possess ideas upon honorable and divine subjects, or whether it is itself divine, or the most divine of any property which we possess; the energy of this part according to its proper virtue must be perfect happiness; and that this energy is contemplative has been stated. This also would seem to agree with what was said before, and with the truth; for this energy is the noblest, since the intellect is the noblest thing within us, and of subjects of knowledge, those are noblest with which the intellect is conversant. . . .

"We think also that pleasure must be united to happiness; but of all the energies according to virtue, that according to wisdom is confessedly the most pleasant; at any rate wisdom seems to contain pleasures worthy of admiration, both in point of purity and stability; and it is reasonable to suppose that this mode of life should be pleasanter to those who know it than to those who are only seeking it."

From the "Politics": . . . "Let us therefore be well agreed that so much of happiness falls to the lot of every one as he possesses of virtue and wisdom, and in proportion as he acts according to their dictates. For good fortune is something of necessity different from happiness, as every external good of the soul is produced by chance or by fortune; but it is not from for-

tune that anyone is just or wise. Hence it follows, as established by the same reasoning, that the state which is best, and acts best, will be happy; for no one can fare well who acts not well; nor can the actions of either man or city be praiseworthy without virtue and wisdom. For valor, justice and wisdom have in a state the same force and form as in individuals; and it is only as he shares in these virtues that each man is said to be just, wise, and prudent. . . .

"If, then, of all courses of action which are according to the virtues, those which have to do with politics and war excel in beauty and greatness; and these have no leisure, and aim at some end, and are not chosen for their own sakes; but the energy of the intellect is thought to be superior in intensity, because it is thought to be contemplative; and to aim at no end beyond itself, and to have a pleasure properly belonging to it; and if this increases the energy; and if self-sufficiency, and leisure, and freedom from cares (as far as anything human can be free) and everything which is attributed to the happy man, evidently exist in this energy; then this must be the perfect happiness of man, when it attains the end of life complete; for nothing is incomplete of those things which belong to happiness.

"But such a life would be better than man could attain to; for he would live thus, not so far forth as he is man, but as there is in him something divine. But so far as this divine part

surpasses the whole compound nature, so far does its energy surpass the energy which is according to all other virtue. If, then, the intellect be divine when compared with man, the life also, which is in obedience to that, will be divine when compared with human life. But a man ought not to entertain human thoughts, as some would advise, because he is human, nor mortal thoughts, because he is mortal; but as far as it is possible he should make himself immortal, and do everything with a view to living in accordance with the best principles in him; although it be small in size yet in power and value it is far more excellent than all. Besides this would seem to be each man's "self," if it really is the ruling and the better part. It would be absurd, therefore, if a man were to choose not his own life, but the life of some other thing. And what was said before will apply now; for that which peculiarly belongs to each by nature is best and most pleasant to every one; and consequently to man, the life according to intellect is most pleasant, if intellect especially constitutes man. This life, therefore, is the most happy."

This is the morality and the religion of one whom Christians are pleased to call "a pagan philosopher."

Enough has been shown to disclose the character of the system of Ethics and Logic developed by Aristotle, but a word remains to be said of the "Nominalism" of Plato, and we will close our

study of the doctrines of the Athenian Philosophers. Plato reduced all propositions, whether in the realm of morals, metaphysics, or in the domain of matter, to an Idea. This, in his system, is the ultimate, irreducible and indivisible finality. In this he went much farther than Democritus, a contemporary, who reduced the physical universe to molecules and then to atoms and affirmed of these, weight and extension, life and motion. Plato stands for Nominalism or Idealism; Aristotle for Realism.

There are but two other schools or systems of Ethics of distinctive character,—Christianity and Utilitarianism. In the former, Christian virtue is associated with piety and is available to the unlearned and the well-informed alike. The "virtue" of Socrates, of Plato and of Aristotle, is rather the product of logic and not easily or fully discerned by the ignorant and unthinking masses,—a class which should be lost in the evolution of an advanced civilization and a deserving and self-conscious democracy. Ethics in the Athenian schools, discloses the proper motive behind human action, but promises no remission of sins on confession for violation of the laws of nature. Nature rewards the man who is governed by reason and punishes the man who has violated nature's laws. There is no escape from such penalties; no external power can cleanse one who has persistently wallowed in filth. Away with the doctrine urged by Cardinal Bossuet in his funeral oration over the body of Condé, that

"there is a penitence as glorious as innocence itself." It's false; that which a man sows he shall likewise reap. This is the law of nature, than which no higher law can be known and apprehended. Let us not deceive ourselves. Peripateticism is right; there is no atonement for violated law, in nature or in morals, but to suffer the resultant effects of that violation.

In the categories of Christian Ethics, the crowning postulate is this:—that we reach the Deity through the medium of prayer. It is not a new proposition; it was not born with Christianity. Prayer is an attitude; a fervent desire uttered; an expectancy charged with energy. Its effects are psychological. It is the strongest form of auto-suggestion. We are transformed in body and mind, measurably with the intensity of our feelings, into the image of the object of our worship. The effectiveness of prayer depends upon the attitude of the subject rather than the object; therefore the benefits and results appear to be subjective rather than objective, but these benefits are, however, none the less helpful.

Christian Ethics lead directly and powerfully to Asceticism. This was recognized and admitted and this mode of life was generally adopted by the early Christians. Many of the austere and consecrated bishops of the Church, in the first three centuries, went so far in this direction as to make themselves eunuchs for Christ's sake.

Asceticism is recognized as a means to Christian perfection and favored by the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches to our day, and it has withstood the adverse forces of western civilization with a steadfast determination that is marvelous. However, those of us who are Christian one day in seven, need not fear, nor heed, the call of the monastery. This characteristic of Christian Ethics, as shown in its precepts, deters men from embracing Christianity, for they recognize that its precepts, while admirable as ideals, yet lack objective practicability. The intensely practical man of large affairs and of great responsibility will be influenced and drawn more by the doctrines of Peripateticism than by the precepts of Christianity and he will be disposed to follow Aristotle rather than Jesus.

We are sometimes led to recognize and understand the salient points contained in a given proposition by considering their opposites, and for this purpose it is well to consider a few precepts of Utilitarianism. This more modern school, led by John Stuart Mill, holds that utility is the test of morality.

Utilitarianism is externalism. It is directly opposed to the idealism of Plato and the asceticism of Christianity. The moral virtues of the inner soul, or "active intellect," or "active reason," are not innate, but are rather institutional.

Conscience is molded on external authority

and is not the unerring monitor affirmed by Christianity. Morality is derived from external experience. It is not derived from nature, but is acquired. What is regarded as morality by one people, in a given state, may not be morality with another people, in another state. From the stand-point of metaphysics Utilitarianism affirms that our ideas proceed from sensation and are not innate. This is Epicureanism. Very important conclusions may be deduced from these propositions but we will not follow them.

It has been said facetiously, that the ancients stole all our ideas and knowledge. In the realm of the moral and religious sciences this is to a great extent true. In the preceding pages I have considered the several systems which comprise the warp and woof of ethical science. All that is of modern growth harks back to Athens, where the foundation principles were thought out, lived and established.

One system, however, of modern growth and of distinctive character is worthy of notice, and I shall digress from the tenor of my subject, for a moment briefly to consider it. Henry George of San Francisco conceived a system of political economy and ethics based on the land question. In this, George denies the right of individual ownership of the land. His system is well developed and set out in his first book, an admirable work, titled "Progress and Poverty," a work that has powerfully influenced economists and moral-

ists in recent years, and which shall some day work a revolution in governments that will be radical to the last degree, but which, when this revolution shall have been accomplished, will do much to bring to men that equality of opportunity, of fortune and enjoyment which social democracy holds to be the ideal condition.

The aim of this system is to make the means of production open to all, that all and each may have the opportunity and the benefits now enjoyed by comparatively few to the exclusion of the many. It is affirmed by this school that the land is the inheritance of the whole race, and, as the air and the waters, should be free to all, subject to a rental to be paid the government, which rental shall be the sole taxation imposed on the citizens, or the people, for the support of government. No other barrier shall prevent the free use and occupation of the land; this right of occupation shall be so well guarded that it may descend to posterity from generation to generation and all improvements shall be free from taxation and remain the property of those who make them, in perpetuity, subject to renewal of leases of the land from decade to decade.

This question is appropriately raised: what influences or conditions create land values? There is but one answer, population. The northeast corner of Broadway and Wall Street in the city of New York, for example, on which the First National Bank of that city is located, is probably

the most valuable piece of land on the western hemisphere. Why is this lot or plot so valuable? Because 200,000 people pass that corner and turn down Wall Street and return by it daily, and it thus has become one of the most accessible business locations in America. If 200,000 people passing that location daily give the almost incredible value to that property which it possesses, why should not these who contribute to this value, or impart it, participate in it? The owners have done little or nothing to create this enormous value. Why should they possess it all? Growing population brings to the community, or municipality, increasing land values, higher rents, increased cost of living, ownership of the land by the few, dispossession of the many,—conditions that are undemocratic and unjust. Poverty, and the ignorance, immorality and crime which come from poverty, will measurably disappear when we shall have equal opportunity in the use of land and to the means of production that are based on land.

This proposition was not first voiced by Henry George, though he was not, probably, aware that another had preceded him. In 1762 Jean Jaques Rousseau, a Frenchman, then residing at Geneva, wrote a little book titled "The Social Contract" which palpitates with social energy from cover to cover. This book was written twenty-seven years before the French Revolution and was an instigating and supporting power behind that

great revolution,—a revolution which broke down one of the most iniquitous and unjust governments that Europe had witnessed; which brought an end to the rule of the Capets, who had governed, robbed and oppressed France for nine centuries; which led Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette to the Guillotine and transformed the government of tyrants into a Republic.

It was from this little book that Thomas Jefferson drew much of the splendid social doctrine contained in our Declaration of Independence,—"that all men are born free and equal"; . . . "that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." These propositions were affirmed by Rousseau, in one form or another, fourteen years before the American Revolution and this work of Rousseau was known to Jefferson prior to 1776, and he showed familiarity with it when he was minister to France in 1784-1786.

Rousseau touches the subject of individual ownership of the land in this brisk, energetic and characteristic manner: "The first man, who, having enclosed a plot of ground, proceeded to say, 'This belongs to me,' and found other men simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society. What crimes, what wars, what murders, what miseries and what horrors he would have saved humanity who, grabbing up the posts, or filling up the ditch, would have cried out to his fellow men, 'Do not listen to this impostor, you

are lost if you forget that the fruits are to all, and that the land belongs to no one.' " [9]

Had this proposition been incorporated in our Declaration of Independence in 1776, and later incorporated in the Constitution, it would have wrought most important and beneficient conditions in our country. We would not now be face to face with monstrous wealth centralized in the possession of a few, and on the other hand abject poverty and destitution general and widely diffused. The crimes of the Bowery and the distress of the Ghetto could not have become characteristic conditions of our great cities.

Thomas Jefferson was alive to this question in his day of usefulness and power and advocated the proposition that the ultimate title to the land should be retained by the government, and the right of use and occupation only should be transferred to the individual or citizen. Possibly his long and bitter fight in the Virginia Legislature, in 1776, for the repeal of the laws of entail and abolition of primogeniture,—a relic of feudalism, which alienated from him many friends and made powerful enemies of them—as in case of the

[9] "Le premier qui ayant enclos un terrain s'avisa de dire: 'Ceci est à moi,' et trouva des gens assez simples pour le croire, fut le vrai fondateur de la société civile. Que de crimes, de guerres, de meurtres, que de misères et d'horreurs n'eût point épargnés au genre humain celui qui, arrachant les pieux ou comblant le fossé, eût crié à ses semblables: 'Gardez-vous d'écouter cet imposteur; Vous êtes perdus si vous oubliez que les fruit sont à tous, et que la terre n'est à personne.' "

Randolphs,—may have deterred him from urging this radical measure at that time.

Legislation in a Republic or Democracy should favor the diffusion of wealth, not its concentration. Ours is unquestionably a representative form of government, but centralized wealth, the special interests and tariff beneficiaries have been represented better than, and rather to the exclusion of, the people generally, for nearly fifty years.

At this late day, in our country, we can not right the wrong growing out of the land question, due to our early neglect. We shall see these benefits embraced and enjoyed by other states and countries. We can now only hope to approach the realization of this system by the medium of discriminating and discriminative taxation and even this may prove to be unpopular if not impracticable.

Having considered the character and the work of the several schools of Greece we are justified in believing and affirming that, if these schools had not been suppressed by royal edict in the interest of Christianity, they would by now have given the world all that is best in morals and religion. That phase of worship which is based wholly on the emotions and which characterizes much that is foremost in Christianity, would not have been developed; that predominating influence based upon, and developed from, superstí-

tion and belief in miracles, would have been passed by; while all that could have been drawn from reason and virtuous action would have been established, and all that could have been affirmed of Deity, coming as legitimate deductions from logic, and from the revelations of the sciences, would have been ours to a greater extent, and to a larger degree, than now.

Creasy has portrayed to us in his work, "Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World," how a number of great battles of history have sealed the fate of governments and peoples and changed the boundary lines of nations. When we consider the issues that were involved at Marathon, at Arbela, at Pharsalia, at Poictiers and at Waterloo, and what would have followed had the results of these conflicts been reversed; we may in this manner consider and estimate what we have lost, or gained, in the moral world by the conflicts which were waged between Christianity and the numerous schools of ethics and religion of ancient Greece.

We may perhaps conclude that as the arbitrament of the sword, on the field of battle, has not always been in accord with the best interests of humanity, so the conflicts in the moral and religious world have not in all cases ended happily and for the best interests of mankind. The world can never pay the debt it owes to the Athenian scholars for their work in the interest of, and for the benefit of humanity. Shakespeare makes *Marc Anthony* say, while bending over the dead

body of *Cæsar:* "Thou art the ruins of the noblest man, that ever lived, in the tide of times." This is extravagant praise to be given a tyrant who had turned the army of a Republic against the Republic, and, on the field at Pharsalia, overturned the Republic and created the Empire. Four centuries before Cæsar, there lived at Athens a group of scholars and statesmen—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Democritus and Demosthenes—who gave the world conceptions of life, systems of morals, duties of citizenship, and a store of knowledge more abundant, more useful and more glorious; and of whom it might with greater propriety be said, and of whom it is more profoundly true: "These are the greatest men, that ever lived, in the tide of times."

V

PARALLELS; EARLY BELIEFS; MIRACULOUS CONCEPTIONS

SUPERNATURAL OCCURRENCES AND PARALLELS

It is contrary to the judgment and experience of our age, and opposed to the attitude and bent of our western civilization, to entertain belief in supernatural occurrences, and as the decades go by we shall come to a period wherein disbelief in miracles and supernatural occurrences will become universal.

The supernatural occurrences related in the old and new scriptures have their parallels in Greek, Egyptian and Assyrian mythology. Poseidon, an early Greek divinity, had smote the rock and brought forth water, and Moses smote the rock in Horeb and water came forth.

Jesus was crucified on March 25th, A. D. 29. Of the miraculous occurrences said to have followed that event, of the earthquake and eclipse of the sun, accredited historians of that time make no mention.

St. Matthew's account: "Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour, . . . and behold the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bot-

tom; and the earth did quake and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose," etc.

St. Mark's account: "And when the sixth hour was come there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour, . . . and the veil in the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom."

St. Luke's account: "And it was about the sixth hour and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour, and the sun was darkened, the veil in the temple was rent in the midst."

The three Synoptists agree in their account of two supernatural occurrences, while St. Matthew alone relates two other and additional occurrences.

Now, Cæsar was assassinated by the conspirators (I prefer to call them patriots) on March 15th, B. C. 44, or seventy-three years and some ten days earlier than the day of the crucifixion of Jesus. Let us consider the supernatural occurrences said to have taken place at that time.

Says the historian, Pliny: "The sun was pale and without splendor for the greater part of the year."

Plutarch says: "As Cæsar was sacrificing, the victim's heart was missing, a very bad omen, because no living creature can live without a heart. . . . The most singular preternatural appearances (following his death) were the great comet which shone very bright for seven nights

and then disappeared; and the dimness of the sun whose orb continued pale and dull for the whole of that year, never showing its ordinary radiance at its rising and giving but a weak and feeble heat."

We have in Josephus a transcript of a letter from "MARCUS ANTONIUS, Imperator, to Hyrcanus the High Priest," in which Marc says: . . . "But we have taken vengeance on those (the conspirators) who have been the authors of great injustice towards men and of great wickedness towards the gods; for the sake of which, we suppose it was, that the sun turned away his light from us, as unwilling to view the horrid crime they were guilty of in the case (death) of Cæsar."

VIRGIL SAYS:

"Such lightnings never fired the unclouded air
Nor Comets trailed so oft their blazing hair,
For this in equal arms Phillippi viewed
Rome's kindred bands again in gore imbrued."

By some, these accounts are received with confidence, but to my mind they are not to be believed. They sprung from the imagination of men whose minds were steeped in superstition. However, the authors, doubtless, had no thought of deceiving posterity.

The same God under different names

When Demetrius was collecting books and liter-

ary works for the Alexandrian library, in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, B. C. 265, and after he had secured "twenty times ten thousand books," it was his wish to secure the laws (scriptures) of the Jews and have them translated into the Greek. And when Aristius was pleading with the king to set free his Jewish captives as a preliminary to the proposed work of translating the Jewish scriptures, he urged this: "Because the God who supporteth thy kingdom, was the author of their laws as I have learned by particular inquiry, for both, these people and we also worship the same God, the framer of all things. We call him, and that truly, by the name of Zeus or Jupiter." And so when the seventy learned Jews had come to Alexandria and had translated the Bible into Greek, it was discovered and affirmed by the scholars of Alexandria, that Jehovah of the Jews, Zeus of the Greeks and Jupiter of the Romans were but different names for the same God.

. . . . . .

Sejanus, a contemporary of Jesus, had long been the confidant and friend of Emperor Tiberius. He had compassed the death of Agrippina —grand-daughter of the deified Augustus—and her two sons; he had, moreover, poisoned Drussus, the emperor's son and heir to the throne, all with the acquiescence and connivance of the unspeakable Tiberius. Laudation that the people bestowed on Sejanus, as the friend and adviser of the emperor, was by him esteemed to be his due

and he became ambitious to possess imperial and divine honors. Tiberius became suspicious of Sejanus, turned against him and brought about his death.

Three historians, Tacitus and Juvenal in the first century and Dio Cassius in the second, mention a number of supernatural occurrences arising immediately before the fall and execution of Sejanus. Says Dio Cassius: "Ravens alighted on his head and flapped their wings in his face as he went to sacrifice. An eruption of smoke burst forth from one of his bronze statues in the temple, and the statue of Fortuna was observed to turn on her heel, averting her face, as he passed by,—and Sejanus began to be afraid."

Two Sacrifices Made to the Gods

From the Book of Judges, Chapter XI.—Jephthah, one of the judges of Israel, before beginning his campaign against the Ammonites, a related people, made a vow to his god, Jehovah, that if he would give him victory (and do it first) he would make a "burnt offering" unto him.—"Then the spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah and he vowed a vow unto the Lord and said, 'if thou shalt without fail deliver the Children of Ammon into my hands, then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth from the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the Children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering.' . . .

And after the slaughter of the Ammonites was accomplished, Jephthah came to Mezpeh unto his house, and behold his daughter came out to meet him with timbrels and with dances; and she was his only child."

At the appointed hour, two months later, Jephthah sacrificed his daughter in fulfillment of his vow made "when the spirit of the Lord was upon him." And so Jehovah gave Jephthah the coveted victory, and Jephthah gave Jehovah his daughter's blood and the transaction was closed.

. . . . . .

King Agamemnon's fleet lies motionless in the harbor at Aulis and his soldiers are smitten with a foul and fatal disease. He should be on his way to the siege of Troy. In his trouble and humility he invokes the aid of the gods but receives no encouragement. The priest of the goddess Artemis approaches the king and informs him that the goddess is offended and commands him to give his daughter, Iphigeneia, to be sacrificed for a propitiation,—for if mortals forget their obligations to the gods and become vain in their power and prosperity shall they not pay the price? What man is there in all the world who hath great riches, great power or great renown who hath not made a proportionate sacrifice?

Agamemnon seeks his daughter and pours out his grief.—"O thou fairest pledge of a divine and burning love! O sweet fruit of a joy such as thy mother, Clytaemnestra, alone can give! The

gods demand thy life ere they vouchsafe victory to our arms on the field at Ilium. O Iphigeneia, canst thou give up thy sweet young life that the Greeks may be saved from defeat and thy father from ruin? Let us go to yonder grove and upon that smoking altar there beneath the plane-tree, Calchas—the priest, will let thy blood while I call the gods to witness the extremity of my grief and the greatness of my sacrifice."

And so, when the sun was set, Iphigeneia lay cold in death, her blood congealing on the altar, mute testimony to the bloody but pious superstition of her time.

Two opinions voiced about A. D. 310.

ATHANASIUS

"Away with the story of creation given to Greeks and barbarians by Hesiod! It is false! Jehovah created the world, for it is written in the holy scriptures: 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' "

HIEROCLES

"The tradition of the Greeks has led men to consider the work of creation. The contemplation of this sublime subject has contributed much to the knowledge and piety of the Greeks, for men become great and good by contemplating great things. The Jews have no knowledge of creation above that we possess. Strabo, Pliny, Tacitus and Apuleius believed Moses to have been a sorcerer,—taught the art at Heliopolis."

ATHANASIUS

"Impossible! The garden of the Persian kings is not Paradise! The Garden of the Hesperides and Elysian-fields are not Eden! These are but vain creations of the idolatrous Greeks. We know the reality of Eden for hath not Moses written: 'And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden?' "

HIEROCLES

"We find delight in dwelling upon the sensuous beauty of the shaded and perfumed groves of a Persian paradise, and in our imagination we cling to the charms of the garden of the Hesperides [10] and to the beauty of the Elysian-fields.

[10] The lyric poet, Pindar, in his Second Ode, written B. C. 480, locates the garden of the Hesperides west of the "Pillars of Hercules."—

"The islands of the blest they say,
The islands of the blest,
Are peaceful and happy by night and day,
Far away in the glorious West.

"They need not the moon in that land of delight,
They need not the pale, pale star;
The sun he is bright by day and night,
Where the souls of the blessed are.

"They till not the ground, they plow not the wave,
They labor not—never! O never!
Not a tear do they shed, not a sigh do they heave.
They are happy for ever and ever.

"Soft is the breeze, like the evening one
When the sun hath gone to his rest;

We live and create in our imagination. The Greek has art in his soul, he thinks in form and feature. To him, paradise, the garden of the Hesperides and the Elysian-fields are realities. The Eden of the Jews is no more real."

ATHANASIUS

"Break the images! It was Phidias who created Zeus! Jehovah was not made by human hands! He is the creator, not the created!"

HIEROCLES

"Idealism has created a Supreme God and ascribed to Him attributes that harmonize with the Idea. The Greeks have conceived this Being under the name of Zeus. The Jews, a blood-thirsty people, created their Jehovah with a thirst for blood, burnt offerings and sacrifices."

ATHANASIUS

"Tradition is a liar! The story of the Deucalian deluge and destruction of the human family, save three souls, is monstrous! It is but a Greek superstition! There was but one deluge, Moses has described it: 'And behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of water upon the earth, to destroy all

> And the sky is pure, and the clouds there are none,
> In the islands of the blest.
>
> "The deep clear sea, in its mazy bed,
> Doth garlands of gems unfold;
> Not a tree but it blazes with crowns for the dead,
> Even flowers of living gold."

flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven, and everything that is in the earth shall die.' "

HIEROCLES

"The story of the Deucalian deluge is a very old one. We can not, indeed, affirm that there was such a flood and that the human family well nigh perished in it. Of the same character and dark antiquity is the narrative of the deluge of Noah. Let us hope that the human family never suffered such cruel calamities as these traditions imply."

ATHANASIUS

"Preposterous! How can the Greeks prove that their Hades is a place for the souls of men? Who is Minos that shall judge the dead and mete out rewards and punishments? We know of but one judgment—the last and eternal judgment of the universe. Is it not written that Jesus shall descend and judge the quick and the dead?"

HIEROCLES

"Hope is a strong faculty in the human mind, this led man to speculate on a future state, in time his speculations became belief. The sense of justice in him pictured a possible tribunal and judgments of rewards and punishments. The Jews created Jehovah, Heaven and Hell for the Jews. The Greeks in like manner provided an Elysium and Hades. Our philosophers may banish these creations; already they deny their reality."

ATHANASIUS

"Down with the Demi-gods! Away with Hercules, Dionysus, Agamemnos and the rest of them! These are but vain creations of superstitious people. Who can believe that a progeny has come from a union of gods with women!"

HIEROCLES

"Men of valor and superior force have in all ages received the admiration of their fellow men. Many who were more abundantly endowed with such attributes and blessed by good fortune have been held to have descended from the gods. Now, however, the stature of the people is increasing, that of the heroes diminishing. The Greeks and Romans formerly possessed this weakness. Porphyry says substantially, that Gentile Greeks wrote the sacred books of the Christians and ascribed to Jesus such manner of birth and such attributes as we have given to Hercules, and he questioned the personality and reality of Gabriel and the Holy Ghost."

ATHANASIUS

"Out with your oracles! These are base frauds —the inventions of priests to deceive credulous people!"

HIEROCLES

"Jews and Christians have had their prophets. Christian bishops at Rome and Alexandria are now preaching, from their sacred writings, of the

impending destruction of the world and the Second Coming of Jesus. A century ago these theologians appealed to the Oracle of Sibyl, as that oracle had become Christian."

ATHANASIUS

"Sacrilegious and damnable! The tradition and story of the resurrection of Alceste is false!"

HIEROCLES

"The story of Alceste is venerable. Human love was never more tenderly and deeply expressed than in this charming story to which our Euripides gave the touch of immortality. It was the tender emotion of a glorious and righteous pity that moved Hercules to recall to life the lovable and adorable Alceste and give her back to the embraces of her husband. The story is fragrant with the flower and fruitage of unselfish love, it has the highest charm which the world has thus far expressed in story and song. Beside this, the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus is void of beauty, though not without interest."

Mythology is still in the making. Gregory of Tours affirmed that the seven sleepers of Ephesus were miraculously preserved from death and dissolution and might be seen in his day. We may ask: Who was Pope Joan? Who Presbyter Johannes? Who William Tell? Who were Elf and Fairy? And the century will come in which the child shall ask its preceptor the question:—Who *was* Uncle Sam?

EARLY BELIEFS

Life is a comedy to those who think,
A tragedy to those who feel.
—*Horace Walpole.*

There can be no doubt that the Fathers of the Church believed implicitly in the resurrection of Jesus, and that these good men actually sought martyrdom that they might, through such suffering, imitate the suffering of Jesus. This fact is shown in the proceedings of the Roman courts, found in the records of the pro-consuls. The numerous epistles of Ignatius, too, show this.

The magistrates of Rome could not comprehend the indifference with which Christian violators of the laws approached martyrdom. They contemplated the spectacle with amazement and finally in utter despair.

A Christian of Nicomedia had pulled down and trampled upon a printed edict of Diocletian; he was summarily tried and condemned to the flames. While the executioners stood by with torches in hand, and while the condemned man was being slowly consumed, he steadily pointed the finger of scorn at his executioners and continued to laugh in their faces until choked by the flames.[11]

Martyrdom, however, does not prove a propo-

[11] This martyr was canonized under the name of St. George. His remains were first buried at Nicomedia, later removed and interred at Constantinople, finally dug up by Crusaders and parceled out for relics. A church in Rome claims to possess his skull.

sition to be true. Martyrs simply bet their lives that a given proposition is true. There were pagan martyrs as well as Christian martyrs; both pagan and Christian could not have been right; one or the other was wrong, possibly both were mistaken.

Lucian describes the martyrdom of Peregrin, the Cynic, a voluntary martyrdom undergone to attest and reflect the valor of the Cynics, and incidentally to contribute a spectacle to the celebrants of the rites of the games at Olympia. The incident is thus related: "Peregrin demanded frankincense to throw upon the fire; being supplied he first threw it on; then turning to the South he exclaimed: 'Gods of my Mother, Gods of my Father, receive me with favor,' and with these words he leaped into the pyre. There was nothing more to be seen, however; the towering mass of flames enveloped him completely."

A belief in demons had been held by Greeks and Jews for four centuries prior to the Christian era and was firmly held by the theologians of the first centuries of our era. These good men believed in the activity of demons as fully and as firmly, as they did in the resurrection of Jesus, and had the laws of Rome forbade the teaching of this doctrine, or of exorcising demons, the early Fathers of the Church would have suffered martyrdom for this belief, and for this practice, as quickly and as cheerfully as they did for their other doctrines, beliefs and rites.

If there were demons then, there are demons now. Surely there are no demons now, hence we may confidently affirm that there were no demons then.

Demonology passed out of the serious thoughts of men along with mythology, with magic, with astrology, with alchemy, and with witchcraft. The exorcist, however, was an ordained officer of the early Church and the office was long held to be an important one. His duty was to cast out demons from those who were possessed. This officer is said to have been a busy man.

By observing the attitude of mind of a given people at a given age of the world towards the ordinary circumstances of life, we may come properly to estimate the value of their opinions on other and more serious propositions, cults and beliefs.

The great Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, pupil of the Apostle John, and martyr, declaimed against the clepsydra, which had been devised and developed into a thing of utility and beauty in his day, and which was at that time supplanting the hour glass as a time keeper. This good bishop declared that the clepsydra was an invention of the devil, enjoined all Christians against using it and preached this prohibition to his credulous congregation with the same zeal that he taught and proclaimed the early second coming of Jesus. Surely a man of such an attitude of mind, however good he may be at heart, is not one whom we

would choose to interpret doctrine, or law, or knowledge relating to man's place in nature and his relation to the Infinite or Supreme Being.

St. Augustine may be said to have contributed more to the interpretation of doctrine and to real constructive work in building the foundations of Catholic Christianity than any other, yet this good man said that, in his day the ground still rose and fell over the dead body of the Apostle John, interred at Ephesus.

Barnabas was one of the founders of the Christian Church and wrote doctrinal epistles after the manner of Paul. These epistles were esteemed to be scripture, and were used as such by the early Church. Origen and St. Jerome held the epistles of Barnabas to be canonical in their day. Now observe the character of the reasoning of this great theologian on the prophecy of the coming of Jesus and of His crucifixion.

"Understand, therefore, children, these things more fully, that Abraham, who was the first who brought in circumcision, from Egypt, looking forward in the spirit to Jesus, circumcised, having received the mystery of three letters.

"For the Scripture says that Abraham circumcised 318 men of his house. But what therefore was the mystery that was made known unto him?

"Mark first the 18, and next the 300. For the numeral letters of 10 and 8 are I. H. and these denote Jesus. And because the cross was that by which we were to find grace; therefore he adds

300; the note of which is T, the figure of His cross. Wherefore by two letters he signified Jesus, and by the third His cross.

"He who has put the engrafted gift of His doctrine within us, knows that I never taught to anyone a more certain truth; but I trust that ye are worthy of it."

Is Barnabas, then, to be a guide to lead us to an understanding of the creation of the universe and the destiny of man?

Clement of Rome, Lactantius and Tertullian believed in the Phoenix; that the young bird, on the third day, rose from the ashes of the old; that this phenomenon had often been observed at Heliopolis as related by Pliny, Herodotus and Tacitus. These great theologians of primitive Christianity referred with confidence to this incident in support of the gospel account of the resurrection of Jesus. Is not the story of the Gadarene lunatic and swine of this character? Do we really believe the story which Matthew makes Jesus endorse and say: "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth?" This narrative was illustrated by sketch on the walls of the catacombs at Rome within a century after Jesus is said to have referred to it, the marine animal there depicted is a mythical monster and in no manner resembles a whale. If the animal that swallowed Jonah was a myth, the story cannot have been true.

These Greeks had been recently converted from nature-worship to Christianity. They had seen the statue of Minerva on occasion brandish a spear, and the marble statue of Apollo sweat when the god was thought to be under great excitement. They had read how the army of Regulus had been put under arms and in the field, in Africa, against a dragon.

It was a wonder working age. Miracles were cheap and could be seen performed on the steps and in the porticos of the temples in Rome, any time of day, or night, for a few *sesterces*, and in Athens, on any market day, for a few *obols*.

The Pagan temples had their mysteries and rites of initiation; so had the Christian churches. The voice that spake to Socrates, that had spoken to Moses and the Prophets; that spake to Belshazzar by the writing on the wall seen at a drunken feast, through the "bottom of his glass darkly," that spake to Numa when the foundations of Rome were laid; that spake at Delphi and at Dodona was now, in the early centuries of the Church, speaking through the Pontiffs at Rome and was soon to speak through Francis of Assisi and Joan of Arc. It speaks now through super-sensitives and "mediums."

If some hear voices, which may not be attributed to fraud, or to imagination, an explanation of the phenomenon may be found in the science of psychology. With many, thoughts become audible when they become intense. Possi-

bly a belief in supernatural voices has had vogue by reason of the loose manner in which ancient people were wont to speak of such matters. Pope Eugenius urged the crusade and sent this message to the king of France: "The Living God hath charged me to tell unto thee that He will punish those who shall not have defended Him against His enemies." Does anyone now believe that the "Living God" spake to Pope Eugenius?

There were employed at the temple of Serapis in Alexandria implements of an unspeakable character used in the worship of that god to deceive the multitude. At the convent of Thuringia there was a statue of the Virgin Mary and infant Jesus so constructed or contrived that it would bow in acknowledgment of offerings placed upon the altar and turn its back on those who came empty handed.

A prophet had raised to life a dead body, and had cured the afflicted. Apollonius of Tyana had raised to life the dead body of a woman at Rome. Vespasian had touched the afflicted, bidding them to rise and walk, and they were instantly made whole, and so it came to pass that Jesus and the Apostles raised the dead to life and cured the afflicted. Charles X., of France, when consecrated at Rheims, touched those who were afflicted with scrofula, bidding them be healed. Gregory of Tours taught that exorcists and relics were more potent to cure disease than physicians. Numerous accounts of cases of res-

urrections from the dead and of miraculous cures have come down to us from various sources, Christian and non-Christian. Modern good sense, however, consigns them all to the category of unbelievable things, except so far as in the case of cures, one mind may have influenced another through the medium of suggestion. Hume says and truly: "Nothing is credible that is contrary to experience, or at variance with the laws of nature."

Prayer has been employed since the dawn of civilization and before. With the Greeks and Romans, prayer to their divinities had these characteristics: It was intercessory, it was supplicatory, it was propitiatory and gratulatory, and this rite has been taken over by Christians and Mohammedans without changing its original character.

The Greeks ascribed their victory at Marathon to the assistance rendered them by the gods and made hecatombs to them for their kindly aid. The mythology of the Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Assyrians,—and may we not include that of the Jews? [12]—everywhere proclaims the efficacy of prayer offered to the numerous gods.

It may be observed here that prayer has ever ignored the universal Fatherhood of God. It has ever denied by implication at least, the constancy of nature and of nature's laws. Christian

[12] Victor Hugo,—"Eighteen hundred years ago a quarrel arose between Pagan mythology and Christian mythology."

ideals, voiced in prayer, have been generally good, however Christians have employed this rite in support of the most selfish interests, from abetting murder down to an ordinary petition for rain. We may say the same of nature-worship. If the supplicant was good, the ideals he voiced were good. Socrates, in the woods, by a mountain stream, in the early spring, winged his prayer to the Sylvan God in these words:—"O dear Pan, and ye other gods who frequent this spot, grant me, in the first place, to be good within; and as for outward circumstances, may they be such as harmonize well with my inward capacities. Grant me ever to esteem the wise man as alone the worthy man, and wealth as much as I may use well."

SUPERNATURAL OR MIRACULOUS CONCEPTIONS

B. C. 2448. Genesis VI, 11: "That the Sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." Thus when the world was young we appear to have had "Miraculous Conceptions" galore.

B. C. 1913: Hebrews VII, 1: "For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, Priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and

blessed him. . . . without father and without mother, without descent having neither beginning of days nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God abideth a priest continually." This is the most remarkable character in history. He is written of first in Genesis, then in the Psalms and mentioned twice by Paul in the Hebrews. That a man should be found amongst us having neither father nor mother, especially without a mother, is very hard to understand! This was long before the incubator was devised! Paul believed this record of Melchizedek and Paul founded Gentile Christianity.

B. C. 1100. Hercules, one of the early divinities of the Phoenicians and Greeks, was the son of the god Zeus and his mother was Alcmene of Thebes. Hercules was worshiped by the most enlightened people on the earth for over twelve hundred years. No fewer than one hundred instances of miraculous conceptions of this character may be found recorded in the "Theogony" of Hesiod, B.

C. 850. Among the most noteworthy may be mentioned,—Agamemnon, King of Greece, whose mother was a goddess. Agamemnon was long worshiped in Sparta as "Zeus Agamemnos." There was, too, the renowned soldier who fought at Troy, Achilles, whose mother was the goddess Thetis and his father Peleus. And the pious Aeneas, son of the Goddess Venus, and founder of the Latin Race.

B. C. 900. Mithra. The birth of Mithra is said to have been miraculous. It was witnessed and testified to by Aryan shepherds of Persia, who brought gifts and adored him. The incidents of his birth and life are mentioned in the Iranian *Avesta* and Hindu *Vedas*. At the end of his mission and work he is said to have been transfigured and translated, disappearing in a chariot swiftly drawn upward toward the sun. The worship of Mithra continued from 900 B. C. to A. D. 1500. This religion was embraced by Commodus, Diocletian, Galerius and Julian; became the religion of the

Roman legions, and by the third century A. D. had so completely covered the Roman empire that "It seemed on the verge of becoming the universal religion." It gave way to Manichæism and Christianity.

B. C. 725. Romulus, the founder of Rome. We are told by the historian Livy, that Romulus was the son of the god Mars and the vestal virgin, Silvia, and that for centuries he was worshiped as the patron divinity of the Roman people. He was worshiped under the name of "Quirenius" in the early history of Rome,—in the reign of the Tarquins. His worship was continued throughout the Republic and well into the Empire. Martial mentions the temple of Quirenius and the worship of this divinity in the first century of our era.

B. C. 700. Smyrna claimed to be the birthplace of Homer and his birth was there long held to have been supernatural. The Homereum—a beautiful structure—was built at this city for his formal worship.

B. C. 600. Dionysus, was worshiped first in Thebes, later generally over Greece and Asia Minor. Festivals were established in his honor at Mount Citheron and at Mount Parnassus. Herodotus writes of the ecstatic devotion paid to Dionysus and states that he had for his mother a Greek woman, named Semele, and for his father the god Zeus.

B. C. 582. Pythagoras of Samos. From the biographers of Pythagoras, or rather from his commentators—Porphyry and Iamblichus, we learn that his father was the renowned god Apollo. That he was a philosopher and established a school of ethics, which approached to a religious system. He taught the Egyptian doctrine of transmigration of soul, and the infallible relations existing between numbers, which may be termed a part of the science of mathematics. His philosophy enjoined reverence toward the gods and to parents, justice, gentleness, temperance, purity of life, prayer and regular self examination. This good man, or son of

a god, was the first to announce that our world is a planet, that it is associated with other planets and that these revolve around the sun. This was the heliocentric theory which Christianity, six hundred years later, bitterly opposed. Jesus gave to the world no knowledge of the universe, nor even of this planet on which we live.

B. C. 460. Pericles was worshiped over Greece as an incarnation of Zeus.

B. C. 427. Plato. It is said the Egyptian disciples of Plato taught that his mother, Perictione, had, as a Virgin, suffered a miraculous conception by the god Apollo, that the god had declared to Ariston this circumstance and that Ariston married her thereafter. Seneca, in the first century, relates, that certain Magi from Persia, who then happened to be in Athens, visited the tomb of Plato and offered incense to him as to a divinity."

B. C. 330. Alexander the Great. The oracle informed Alexander that his father was the god Jupiter Am-

mon and not Philip of Macedon. After this information from the oracle, Alexander signed his letters and decrees, "King Alexander, Son of Jupiter Ammon." His mother, Olympia, however, denied the assumption.

B. C. 325. Ptolemy, half brother of Alexander, was called a "Saviour" by his Egyptian subjects.

B. C. 102-44. Julius Cæsar, claimed to have descended, on his father's side, from the gods. Guizot quotes him thus: "My aunt Julia is, maternally, the daughter of kings; paternally, she is descended from the immortal gods; my family unites, to the sacred character of kings, who are the most powerful amongst men, the awful majesty of the gods, who have even kings in their keeping."

B. C. 4.—
A. D. 1? Jesus. Matthew I. XVIII. "Now the birth of Jesus was on this wise: When his mother, Mary, was espoused to Joseph (before they came together) she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." St. Luke, . . . "And the Angel said unto them (the shep-

herds) fear not, for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord."

From a very old Gospel attributed to St. James:

"Then Joseph arising from the ground, called Mary and said: 'O thou, who hast been so much favored by God, why hast thou done this? Why hast thou thus debased thy soul, who was educated in the Holy of Holies, and received thy food from the hands of Angels?' But she with a flood of tears, replied, 'I am innocent, and have known no man.' Then said Joseph, 'how comes it to pass thou art with child?'

"Mary answered: 'As the Lord my God liveth I know not by what means.'

"Then Joseph was exceedingly afraid and went away from her, considering what he should do with her; and he thus reasoned with himself; if I conceal her crime, I shall be found guilty by the law of the Lord; and if I discover her

to the children of Israel, I fear, lest she, being with child by an Angel, I shall be found to betray the life of an innocent person. What therefore shall I do?

"I will privately dismiss her.

"Then the night was come upon him, when he beheld an Angel of the Lord, appeared to him in a dream, and said, 'Be not afraid to take that young woman, for that which is conceived by her is of the Holy Ghost, and she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.'

"Then Joseph arose from his sleep, and glorified the God of Israel, who had shown him such favor and preserved the Virgin."

B. C. 4. Apollonius of Tyana. It is related by two historians,—Philostratus and Dio Cassius—that Apollonius had for his father the god Proteus, and that Proteus appeared to his mother and informed her that the child with which she was then pregnant was an incarnation of himself. It is narrated that when the child was born, "the messengers of Apollo

sang at his birth," as the Angels sang at the birth of Jesus. Other prodigies also are said to have manifested themselves at that time.

Apollonius became a preacher and a teacher of morals and religion and was late in life called the "Pagan Christ." He opposed the immorality and cruelty of that insufferable prince, Domitian, and everywhere over the empire, held the wickedness of the emperor up to view and ridiculed his assumption of the title, "Our Lord and God." (*Dominus et Deus noster.*) The emperor therefore had Apollonius apprehended and brought before him, whereupon Domitian asked Apollonius this question: "Why art thou called God?"

A. D. 14. In the reign of Tiberius, this remarkable circumstance is said to have occurred:

A Roman lady of wealth and many attainments and possessed of unusual beauty was a regular worshiper at the temple of Anubis in Rome. One day a priest of this temple called on her, at her home

and stated that the god Anubis had expressed his desire to have her remain at the temple over night, that he wished to visit with her. The lady felt honored that the object of her worship had thus expressed his desire to visit her, and made appointment as the priest had advised. I cannot relate here, what followed. The details of this unhappy incident are related in Josephus' "Antiquities of the Jews," Book 18, Chap. 3. The conception which followed was not an "immaculate" one. The fraud was detected by the merest accident but in time to save the world from the burden of another "miraculous conception." This occurrence was brought to the attention of Tiberius, who promptly caused the temple to be demolished and the priests crucified.

A. D. 10-90. Simon Magus or Simon of Gitta, was a Samaritan Jew, a convert to Christianity and founder of the Samaritan Gnostic Christian sect known for several centuries as "The Simoniani." He is mentioned in the Acts, was a friend of Felix, written of by Josephus, and

himself claimed to be "an incarnation of the Divinity." The Christian Father, Justin Martyr, writing at about A. D. 138, mentions Simon,—"one who performed such miracles in Rome, in the reign of Claudius, that he was thought to be a god and the emperor honored him with a statue." And further says that the Samaritans and many of the other nations "acknowledged him as the first God." Mention is made of him by Irenæus (A. D. 180). Tertullian (A. D. 200). Hippolytus (A. D. 220). Origen (A. D. 270). Cyprian (A. D. 260). And by St. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (A. D. 340). Cyril gives this rather ambiguous account of his death: "Simon had given out that he was soon to be translated to heaven, and was actually careering through the air in a chariot drawn by demons, when Peter and Paul knelt down and prayed, and their prayer brought him to earth a mangled corpse."

A. D. 39. Agrippa, king of the Jews, in the reign of Claudius, was held by

many Jews to be a god. At a great festival, held at Cesarea, he appeared before the multitude in a garment made wholly of silver and presently many cried out, "Thou art a God; be thou merciful to us, for although we have hitherto reverenced thee only as a man, yet shall we henceforth own thee as superior to mortal nature." This was eleven years after the crucifixion of Jesus. It shows that the Jews were not averse to ascribing attributes of a god to their king.

A. D. 1806. Napoleon allowed the impression that he was more than human, to gain credence with the multitudes in France. The catechism, made at that time by Cardinal Caprara, enjoined all to worship Napoleon. That a prelate could enjoin upon his suffragan bishops and upon the laity, the worship of Jesus and Napoleon, is almost incredible, yet he had precedent to justify, or warrant it. Early in the history of the Church there were families in Rome that worshiped Jesus, Apollonius of Tyana and the gods of Rome. There

were families in Alexandria, too, that worshiped both Jesus and Sarapis. And there are millions now among us who worship, with equal zeal, the Galilean God and Mammon.

VI

THE NAZARENES

Lord Byron makes "Childe Harold" say, when they approach Waterloo,—

> "Stop! for thy tread is on an Empire's dust!
> An earthquake's spoil is sepulchred below!"

It is with this sentiment that I would have the reader approach the consideration of this subject, for we shall here see how a system of religion and ethics, to which the Author gave His fond devotion and His life, suffered defeat and anathema at the hands of a professed believer and disciple, who usurped the name of its founder and gave it to an association of proselytes at Antioch, and ascribed doctrines to Him which we have authority for believing were not uttered nor taught by Him.

Forty days after the crucifixion of Jesus, the Apostles took steps to organize a congregation, or church. This congregation was first domiciled at Jerusalem and was known as "The Nazarenes." Just before the Jews had rebelled against their Roman rulers, and before Jerusalem was beseiged by Titus, in 70 A. D., this congregation, or sect, removed to Pela, a small town "beyond the Jor-

dan," which the Macedonians had built some two centuries earlier, and established themselves there, and when the Roman armies invaded Judea, the Nazarenes were not disturbed. The members of this sect were Jews. They differed from the other Jews no more than the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes differed from one another. The Nazarenes were distinguished most by their belief that Jesus was the promised Messiah and that His coming had fulfilled the prophecies.

An influential member of this sect of the Nazarenes was "James the brother of our Lord," a man of good repute with Pharisees and Sadducees alike, and of whom the historian Josephus speaks as "James the Just." Whatever the Nazarenes believed, therefore, must have been assented to by James. Nay more; Peter and John and the other disciples at Jerusalem, and Mary the mother of Jesus, all were members of this sect of the Jews, and whatever doctrine this sect held must have been assented to by these conspicuous disciples as conforming fully with the teachings of Jesus. And at this early date this sect was not regarded by the Jews as a foreign institution; it was not thought to be anything outside and apart from Judaism; it stood for Judaism, the same as did the other sects mentioned.

From the historian Eusebius we learn that the first fifteen bishops of the church at Jerusalem, and the Nazarenes are included in this general-

ization, were circumcised Jews. Assuming a period of ten years to be the average term, or tenure, of a Bishop, this indicates that the character of this Church, which was established by the Apostles, and which had been presided over by "James the brother of our Lord," had not departed from its early conceptions and creed in the space of one hundred and fifty years. This venerable sect continued true to its early traditions until the Church at Rome, which had been founded by Paul, and which early developed into the "Holy Catholic Church," had anathematized and cursed, as heretical, the Nazarenes and the Church of the Nazarenes, which had been established by the Apostles, and Mary the mother of Jesus and had been presided over by "James the brother of our Lord."

We learn from Paul's epistles that, after his conversion, "while on his way to Damascus," he retired to the desert of Arabia and that he conferred with "neither flesh nor blood," but that he took up the ministry without having familiarized himself with the life and teachings of Jesus. He essayed the establishment of a religion which he knew but little about, for we are given to understand, by Paul himself, that his "apostleship is not of man," but from "our Lord" direct.

As a matter of fact, Paul had neither seen Jesus nor heard him teach, nor had he learned from Peter, or the other disciples, at this early day,

what Jesus had really taught and what claims He had made.

There were no written gospels at this time.

Paul met with a cold reception from the Jews of lower Asia, whither he had gone to begin his missionary work. His meetings in the synagogues were broken up in tumults. Paul himself was sometimes stoned and otherwise roughly handled. Finally he decided to turn away from "the children of the promise," and we find him at Antioch in the latter part of the year 58 A. D., presenting Jesus to the Gentiles. Paul here threw the Jewish law aside, and openly repudiated all that the Jews, of every sect, held sacred and essential; he declared against circumcision, against purification and introduced doctrines, up to this time unknown to the Apostles and to the body of the Church of the Nazarenes at Jerusalem.

It appears from one of the best authenticated epistles of Paul (Galatians) that, anticipating that the apostles at Jerusalem would be displeased with him for introducing innovations so radical and revolutionary, he went up to Jerusalem to make an explanation, "privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run in vain." As a result it appears, from a Pauline source, that Paul was able to make a favorable impression on them and secured the "right hand of fellowship" from many before departing; but the elders of the Nazarenes feeling alarmed, soon sent Peter down to Antioch

to look into Paul's work. It appears that Peter was at first displeased, whereupon Paul says: "I withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed," and it then appears that Peter at once sent for James and John, but that James sent a delegation from the Nazarene congregation to Antioch, but did not go down himself. In the meantime, Peter had relented somewhat and had, with Paul, eaten with the Gentile converts, but when "certain came from James he withdrew, fearing them which were of the circumcision." Whereupon Paul became angry and charged Peter with "dissimulation." The argument was so strong and acrimonious that Barnabas, a Jew, became alarmed at the magnitude of the innovation and at once separated himself from Paul. So we may safely infer that the delegates from the Church at Jerusalem returned feeling displeased and alarmed and uncertain as to the outcome of Paul's course.

It appears that Paul pushed his missionary work with the Gentiles and in a few years, probably about four, from the date of these occurrences, went up to Jerusalem for the last time. From the account given of this circumstance in Acts 21 (and we should bear in mind that the "Acts" were written by Luke, a Greek convert who had, years before, been associated with Paul in the ministry among the Gentiles), we learn that the elders of the Nazarene Church received Paul gladly and then said to him: "Thou seest,

brother, how many thousands (myriads) there are among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are all zealous for the law; and they have been informed concerning thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? They will certainly hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee; we have four men which have a vow on them; these take and purify thyself with them, and be at charges for them, that they may shave their heads; and all shall know that there is no truth in the things whereof they have been informed concerning thee (!) but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, keeping the law." . . . "Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them, went into the temple, declaring the fulfillment of the days of purification, until the offering was offered for every one of them."

It appears from this record that Paul here had recourse to "dissimulation" and did those things commanded in the law, and all in keeping with the request which the brethren of the Nazarene Church had made; which James, "the brother of our Lord," had enjoined; which Peter, the rock on which the Nazarene Church was built, had demanded, and which "John, the blessed disciple," had requested. All after having opposed these brethren at Antioch; after having ad-

vocated an abandonment of the law; after having taken into the Church Greeks, barbarians and what not, simply on confession that "Jesus is the Christ," and receiving baptism on that confession. Thus did Paul alienate himself from the Jews and early brought the religion of Jesus into disfavor with the orthodox Jews, to whom Jesus came as to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

There were certain Jews from lower Asia in Jerusalem at this time, and these recognized Paul, as the officers of the Nazarene Church had expressed their fear would be the case, and a tumult was raised, Paul was arrested and had a hearing at Cæsarea before Felix. The case might be termed thus: "The people of Judea *adversus* Paul of Tarsus." And when the counsel for the prosecution had opened the case, he said among other things: "Notwithstanding that I be not further tedious unto thee, I pray thee, that thou wouldst hear us of thy clemency a few words. For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts 24). This charge was half true and half false. Paul was a "mover of sedition among the Jews throughout the world" because, himself a Jew, he preached the violation of the laws of Moses and the ordinances of the Jews. The charge was false, however, in the statement that Paul was a "ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes," but the counsel in this case doubt-

less did not know that Paul was at variance with the Nazarenes.

From Felix, Paul was sent to Rome in bonds and it appears that within two years thereafter, was lost at Rome in the persecution of "that sect of the Jews" by Nero.

It must be evident to any unbiased mind that the Nazarene Church held strictly to Jewish traditions, and that the founders of this Church were the disciples and kinsmen of Jesus, and we shall presently see that the descendants of a brother of Jesus were also members of this Church. Hence we may believe with all confidence that the doctrines and works of Jesus were known to these and best interpreted by them.

I will here insert a paragraph from a celebrated treatise by Professor Huxley,—titled, "Agnosticism and Christianity," 1889, which has a bearing on this subject though indirectly expressed.

"For suppose it to be established that Gentile Christianity was a totally different thing from the Nazareneism of Jesus and his immediate disciples; suppose it to be demonstrable that, as early as the sixth decade of our era at least (60 A. D.), there were violent divergencies of opinion among the followers of Jesus; suppose it to be hardly doubtful that the Gospels and the Acts took their present shapes under the influence of those divergencies; suppose that their authors, and those

through whose hands they passed, had notions of historical veracity not more eccentric than those which Josephus occasionally displayed; surely the chances that the gospels are altogether trustworthy records of the teachings of Jesus become very slender. And, since the whole of the case of the other side is based on the supposition that they are accurate records (especially of speeches, about which ancient historians are so curiously loose), I really do venture to submit that this part of my argument bears very seriously on the main issue; and, as ratiocination, is sound to the core."

The Nazarenes had written no epistles; the gospels had not, up to the death of Paul, been written, and the work of the Nazarene Church was confined to and among the Jews, and the Jews were now a broken and ruined people, their star of empire set never to rise again. Paul had, however, worked with the Gentiles, these were the aggressive and virile peoples, among whom were the scholars and rulers of the world, from whom the civilization of Europe came, and with it Paul's conception of Christianity.

With the death of Paul in the Neronian persecution, came an end for a time of epistles and other documents proclaiming doctrine. It was, apparently, about twenty years later, that the Synoptic gospels were written; the "Revelations" was the first work to appear after Paul had ceased to write. The gospels were written by various persons in

the latter part of the first and early in the second centuries, without date and without attestation of authorship. These gospels were generally of Gentile source and sympathy, were made to go back, in their accounts, and cover the whole field of tradition and story, from the birth of Jesus and even earlier, and the Greek, or Gentile, authors purposely ignored the Nazarene followers of Jesus. This was carried to such an extent, that as to at least one of the gospels and apparently and probably several of them, the authorship was attributed to Apostles then dead, who had been members of the Nazarene Church and who were, in this manner, made to formulate doctrine and report incidents that were contrary to the known belief and experience of the members of the society to which they had belonged. St. John Chrysostom of Antioch (A. D. 345), the eminent Church Father, Archbishop of Constantinople, says that the names given to the four gospels were first assigned to them about the middle of the second century.

If there is one book in the New Testament canon which bears upon its face the authenticity of its authorship, that book is the General Epistle of James, "the brother of our Lord." James was bishop of the Nazarene Church and he addressed his epistle to "The Twelve Tribes which are of the Dispersion." That is to say, James the Jew addressed his epistles to his brethren, those of his own nationality, who were then, after the fall of Jerusalem, scattered over the Roman empire. For

had not Jesus said that He came to save the lost sheep of the house of Israel?

Gentile Christianity found nothing for the Gentiles in this Nazarene gospel and it did not reckon this book to be genuine. It was not put in the canon, in fact, until the fourth century (A. D. 363). Even Luther condemned it and called it "a gospel of straw," presumably for the reason that it contains none of the cardinal doctrines of Gentile Christianity. It does not teach the doctrines of Original Sin, Total Depravity, Forgiveness of Sins, Baptism, Grace, Atonement, Predestination, Justification, Hell-fire, or any other good thing prominent in Paul's gospels. With James, the bishop of the Nazarene Church, "the brother of our Lord," works and not faith, deeds and not professions, have the primacy among Christian virtues.

An interesting circumstance, which occurred in the reign of Domitian, is related by Gibbon. Immediately following the rebuilding of the Capitol at Rome, a special and onerous tax was imposed on the Jews, and many Christians, in order to evade the tribute to "the Capitoline Jupiter," claimed that they were Christians and not Jews. All such doubtful cases of individuals, in Judea, were called up before the procurator and publicly examined to ascertain if they were circumcised, for the Roman judges made this sign the distinguishing mark between Jew and Gentile. The Christians had to pay the tax along with the other

Jews. The satirist, Martial, makes mention of these examinations in a highly facetious manner, and at some length.[13] Now there appeared before this tribunal in Judea two young men "of good appearance," who gave their names and lineage and proved to be of the congregation of Nazarenes and grandsons of St. Jude, who was a brother of Jesus. These men were farmers and resided near the village of Cocaba.

Justin Martyr, a Greek theologian, set out his belief, in his dialogue with the Jew, Trypho, written about A. D. 150. His opinion may be expressed in the form of categories. Under the head of "Not Saved" are those who believe as follows:—

1. Orthodox Jews, who refuse to believe that Jesus is the Christ.
2. Jews, who observe the law, who believe Jesus to be the Christ, but who insist that the Gentile converts shall observe the law.
3. Gentiles, who believe Jesus to be the Christ and call themselves Christians, but who eat meat sacrificed to idols.
4. Gentiles, who disbelieve in Jesus as the Christ.

Those that shall be saved are:

5. Jews, who observe the law, believe Jesus to be the Christ, and hold that Gentile converts need not observe the law.
6. Gentile converts who believe Jesus to be the Christ, who observe the laws of the Jews.

[13] "Mentula tributis damnata"!

7. Gentile believers in Jesus as the Christ, who do not observe the law themselves, except the refusal of sacrifices to idols, but do not hold those who do not observe it to be heretics.
8. Gentile believers, who do not observe the law, except in refusing idol sacrifices, and hold that those who do observe it to be heretics.

The second article condemns to future torment the Nazarene followers of Jesus, of whom were Peter, John, Mary and "James, the brother of our Lord."

Justin believed in the pre-existence of Jesus as the "Logos" or "Word." He believed in the resurrection of the body, as did also the Nazarenes and Pharisees, and he believed in the early second coming of Jesus as did likewise the Nazarenes. The doctrine of a judgment and of rewards and punishments had in Justin's day taken on Greek conceptions and had become more formidable, than the belief held by the Nazarenes. Let us listen to a sermon delivered in Rome by Tertullian, a Greek-African theologian, about A. D. 200, titled,—"De Spectaculis."

"Ye are fond of spectacles, O Romans, expect the greatest of all spectacles—the last and eternal judgment of the universe. How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I shall behold so many proud monarchs, so many fancied gods, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many magistrates who persecuted the name of

the Lord liquifying in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians; so many sage philosophers, blushing in red hot flames with their deluded scholars; so many celebrated poets trembling before the tribunal, not of Minos, but of Christ."

The sentiments expressed by Tertullian can hardly be harmonized with the views held on this subject by the Nazarenes. However, this sentiment became a real pleasure to our Puritan Fathers, fourteen centuries later, and inspired the zeal of many a Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards.

The Christianity we know was not cradled in Judea, it was nursed and developed by fiery Gentile Greeks in Mediterranean Africa. We have but a meager conception of the character of the meetings of the early Christians. There was a state of mind engendered, which bordered on fright and frenzy. The preaching of the second century was lurid and realistic enough, it abounded in hyperbole. Worship was then ecstatic,—there was a tumultuous shouting: *Credo! Credo! Credo!*—An hypnotic effect was created which burst forth, anon, in sobs and groans. The burden of a dying world was felt, the flames of hell were seen to flash and the wailing of the damned became audible. The voice that led and dominated those early meetings was of the catacombs. Primitive Christianity was cryptic; it smelt of the odors of the sepulchre.

No theologian can square the doctrines contained in the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed and the Apostles' Creed with the doctrines held to by the Nazarene church of the time of Mary, of Peter, of John, of Jude, and over which was then presiding as bishop "James, the brother of our Lord." This primitive church of the apostles suffered its greatest schism at Antioch and met its "Waterloo" at Rome.

VII

"STROMATA"

APOTHEOSIS

The Augustan period is justly celebrated for its great men in statesmanship, in war and in letters. The civilized world was then dominated by Roman arms, by Roman jurisprudence, and by Roman thought and letters. We admire the force, the justice and the wisdom of Rome's great men of that age, but lament their superstition.

About five years before the birth of Jesus and about the same year in which Philo was born, there came to birth in Tyana of Cappadocia, a child who was destined to receive the attention, the wonder and the adoration of thousands of his fellow men. Temples were built for his worship, priesthoods were established to glorify his name; the oracles of Greece, of Egypt, of Asia and of Rome proclaimed his divinity, and emperors bowed at his shrine. When Apollonius had reached the age of twelve, he became a student in the Pythagorean school of philosophy and was admired for his application and deportment. For five long years he regulated his young life by the hard rules of this school; he ate no meat, he drank no wine, he wore no colored clothing. To obtain knowledge was

his passion, and to sanctify it to the best in morality and religion was his ambition. From school he sought the seclusion of the temple of Aesculapius, where he studied medicine and the arts of healing. He astonished the priests of this temple, for instead of becoming their student, he appears to have been their instructor. From the temple he went forth to teach and to preach, beginning his ministry in the cities of Cilicia and Pamphylia; he traveled and preached over Persia, Assyria and India. It is said that he preached a pure morality, urged a spirit of devotion and that his disciples followed and worshiped him. It is from his disciple, Damis, that the historian Philostratus (A. D. 180), wrote a history or biography of Apollonius, which, we are told, was undertaken at the request of Julia Domna, wife of Emperor Septimius Severus. This work comprises more reading matter than is contained in the books of the New Testament.

By way of parenthesis: The influence of Julia Domna and that of her sister, Julia Mæsa, and of the daughters of Julia Mæsa, Sœmis and Mamæa, was paramount in the government of the Roman empire during the reigns of Caracalla, Macrinus, Elagabalus and Alexander Severus. These empresses were better administrators of the affairs of state than their husbands, or their wards. Julia Domna and Mæsa were beautiful and accomplished women, daughters of a priest of the Sun, whose temple,—El-Gabal—was at Emesa,

Syria. It is to the influence of these women, and to their credit as well, that the penalties and disabilities which afflicted the Jews and Christians were modified and that no important persecutions of the Christians occurred from the latter part of the reign of Septimius Severus to the close of the reign of Alexander Severus. It was Julia Mamæa, neice of Julia Domna and mother of Alexander Severus, who sought and had a two hours' interview with the renowned Greek theologian, Origen, at Antioch, in which, it is said, Origen instructed her in the salient points and claims of Christianity. And it was this Julia Domna whom we have mentioned here, prompted, or ordered, Philostratus to write the biography of Apollonius.

In the exhaustive work of Philostratus not a word is found of criticism, or of commendation, of Jesus, of the Apostles, or of the Christians. From this biography we learn that Apollonius proved his authority to teach and preach by performing miracles; these he wrought at Ninevah, Ephesus, Rome and in the cities of Spain. He healed the sick, foretold the coming of eclipses, and at Rome astonished the magistrates by raising to life the dead body of a "noble lady."

Domitian was assassinated on the 18th day of September, A. D. 96. On this day Apollonius, then a very old man, was in Ephesus. The stirring scene of the tragedy, which took place in the emperor's bed chamber at Rome, was witnessed, subjectively, by Apollonius. He immediately called

the priests and magistrates of Ephesus together and related to them the fact and circumstances of the assassination. This caused immense excitement at Ephesus. Some days later, a courier from Rome brought the news of the murder of Domitian to the Ephesians and the facts corresponded with all that Apollonius had related to them on the day of the assassination.

His biographer closes his account of the life and works of this good man in these words: "Here ends the history of Apollonius as written by Damis; concerning the manner of his death, if he did die, the accounts are various, for some say that he vanished at Lindus."

It is related by Philostratus that the public worship of Apollonius was quite general over the Roman empire and as far east as India; by another authority his worship is said to have been continued for upwards of four hundred years. Emperor Alexander Severus (A. D. 230) had a chapel in his own house in which were the statues of the gods of Rome, Jesus of Nazareth, and Apollonius of Tyana.

Gustave Flaubert wrote a little book of negation (Paris 1846) entitled, "The Temptation of St. Anthony," in which work he assembles representatives of all the sects of the early Christians; depicts the personality, character, speech, cults, and dress of these numerous sectaries in the most realistic manner, and then makes them gather around St. Anthony, while he is seated in front of

his grotto by the cross in the Theban desert. These numerous exponents of Christianity, these hierarchs and heresiarchs are made to express their many and contrary views of God, the Universe, Jesus, and Christianity to St. Anthony as to one whom they would proselyte. The scene becomes impressive, as we read, and we are reminded of the time and circumstance when Agrippa gathered statues of all the gods of the Roman world together and set them up face to face in the Pantheon at Rome. And how the scholars and philosophers of that day looked upon the spectacle and winked at one another! Seneca mentions this incident and states that "the philosophers regarded these religions and the creeds which belonged to them, as all being equally false;" that "the common people believed them to be all equally true;" and that "the magistrates believed them to be all equally useful."

After the sectaries had affirmed and denied almost every article of faith, every doctrinal assumption and every attribute of Deity and nothing but confusion and anger came of the contention, St. Anthony with utter despair in his voice and countenance exclaims: "Who then is the real God?"[14]

The sectaries withdraw from the presence of the saint and the majestic figure of Apollonius of Tyana, and his disciple Damis, appear

[14] "Qui est, maintenant, le vra Dieu"?

at the Grotto and address themselves to St. Anthony.

Apollonius recounts his numerous works, the miracles he had performed and his many pilgrimages, and expresses his desire to enlighten and uplift his fellow men. St. Anthony recognizes this prince of magicians, this "Pagan Christ," and manifests much uneasiness in his presence.

Apollonius finally turns a searching gaze into Anthony's eyes and makes the following inquiries:

APOLLONIUS: "What is thy desire? Thy dream?"[15]

ANTHONY (*murmurs*): "Jesus, Jesus come to my assistance."

[15] APOLLONIUS: Quel est ton désir? ton rêve?
ANTOINE: Jésus, Jésus, à mon aide!
APOLLONIUS: Veux-tu que je le fasse apparaitre Jésus?
ANTOINE: Quoi? Comment?
APOLLONIUS: Ce sera lui! pas un autre! Il jettera sa couronne, et nous causerons face à face!
DAMIS: Dis que tu veux bien! Dis que tu veux bien!
ANTOINE: (Au pied de la croix, murmur des oraisons.)
DAMIS: Voyons, bon ermit, cher St. Antoine! . . . ne vous effrayez pas; c'est une façon de dire exagérée, prise aux orientaux. Cela n'empêche nullment. . . .
APOLLONIUS: Lasse-le Damis! Il croit, comme une brute, à la réalité des choses. La terreur qu'il a des Dieux l'empêche de les comprenre; et il ravale le Dieu au niveau d'un roi jaloux! . . . Par-dessus toutes les formes, plus loin que la terre, au delà des cieux, réside le monde des idées, toute plein du verbe! D'un bond, nous franchirons l'autre espace; et tu saisiras dans son infinité l'Eternel, l'Absolu, l'Etre!

APOLLONIUS: "Would thou have me cause Jesus to appear?"

ANTHONY: (*with some agitation*): "*What?* How?"

APOLLONIUS: "It shall be him and no other, he will throw down his crown, and we will talk face to face."

DAMIS to ANTHONY: "Say that you are willing! Say that you are willing!"

ANTHONY, *silent and frightened, moves to the foot of the cross and repeats the credo.*

DAMIS *continues to urge* ANTHONY *to allow* APOLLONIUS *to present* JESUS *before them.*

APOLLONIUS to DAMIS: "Let him alone, he believes as the brute, in the reality of things. The fear he has of the Gods prevents him from understanding them. He lowers his God to the level of a jealous king.

Above all forms; farther than the earth; beyond the skies, resides the world of ideas all pregnant with the Word! By one leap we will cross the space to the other and seize on his Infinity—the Eternal—the Absolute—the real Being."

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD

Whence came this doctrine of a resurrection of the dead? Moses did not teach it, nor did he proclaim the immortality of the soul. The Jews do not appear to have believed this doctrine, nor to have been generally or specifically familiar with

it, until after they had returned to Judea from their long captivity in Babylon.

The Pharisees were the liberal party; the Sadducees were the conservative. The wealthy and aristocratic families were of the Sadducee sect; the laws of Moses were all in all to them; they would suffer no innovations. When the Pharisees came to think favorably of this Egyptian superstition,—that there shall be a resurrection of the dead,—the Sadducees opposed the new doctrine with energy. The High Priest, John Hyrcanus, B. C. 105, was a Sadducee, and the High Priest, Ananus, who condemned James, the brother of Jesus, to death, was a Sadducee, from which we may infer that it was not an article of faith with the priesthood, that the dead shall rise again.

This belief, then, did not originate with the Jews. The ancient Egyptian mythology had three postulates touching this, or rather a kindred belief. These were:

First: that man had a prior existence.

Second: that he has a present existence.

Third: that he shall have a future existence.

From these premises an early Greek philosopher deduced the theory of a transmigration of soul, and many believed in the even more gross conception of a metamorphosis. The mythology of the Phoenicians and early Greeks reflect a belief in an under world of shades and shadows. We see this especially in the sublime works of

Homer and of Hesiod, B. C. 850. These men lived and wrote two hundred years before the Jews had returned from their captivity in Babylon, in the reign of Cyrus. Some four hundred and fifty years after Homer, we find a better conception of spirit life developed by Socrates and Plato; later, a quite general theory, indefinitely expressed, of the continuity of life came to be believed. It is quite probable that it was from the Egyptian or early Greek speculations, or from the Aryan worshipers of Mithra with whom they came in touch at Babylon, that the Pharisee sect of the Jews came to believe in a final resurrection of the dead. We have in our day, a sect whom we know as Spiritualists, who make belief in the continuity of life an article of faith, and who undertake to demonstrate its truth. After a patient investigation of their claims, and of their methods of demonstration, covering a period of ten years, I am not at all convinced of the truth of their proposition.

This doctrine did not come down to us from God on Sinai. It has been evolved from rude conceptions and adorned with the choicest sentiments of hope and expectation.

The most refined and philosophic belief touching spirit life was brought to the confines of western civilization from remote India. Briefly it is this: that the spirit is an emanation from the Godhead, and that with the dissolution of the body the spirit returns to, and is absorbed by, the God-

head. In this, the process of emanation and absorption is constant.

The most noted exponent of this doctrine in Europe was the celebrated Mohammedan scholar and peripatetic philosopher, Averroes. He holds that it is reasonable and believable that the transition from the individual to the universal, upon the death of the body, is instantaneous. The Buddhists maintain that human personality continues in a declining degree of intensity for a term before non-entity, or nirvana is attained.

The Saracen philosopher, Al-Gazzali, was a powerful representative of this doctrine. He says: "God has created the spirit of man out of a drop of his own light; its destiny is to return to Him. Do not deceive yourself with the vain imagination that it will die. . . . Your spirit came into the world a stranger, it is only sojourning in a temporary home. From the trials and temptations of this troublesome life, our refuge is in God. In reunion with Him we shall find eternal rest."

The Catholic Church has persistently opposed this doctrine and the Lateran Council, A. D. 1512, condemned it formally.

This conception is a beautiful one. Some twenty years ago I had the pleasure of hearing a representative of this faith preach to a cultured audience in San Francisco. He spoke from a philosophic platform. His opening prayer was addressed to the "Infinite Spirit," and as he pro-

ceeded with his invocation, the audience felt the force and sincerity of his belief,—that the spirit within him was truly appealing to the Universal, or Infinite Spirit of which his was a separated part. The imagery, the beauty, the radiance of his conception, and of his appeal, were an inspiration and a joy to all who were present and hung upon his words.

This, and the other theories we have considered, cannot, however, rise to the importance of "beliefs" in a strict sense, for a belief is justified only by the possibilities of demonstration. As a matter of fact we have not progressed much, if any, in knowledge of spirit life beyond that of which the anatomist can inform us. We may be hopeful, but we are not assured.

There is a great gap between the doctrine of the Pharisee and the opinion of the eminent naturalist, Professor Huxley, of the latter part of the last century, whom I abbreviate. He holds that soul, spirit and mind are one and the same thing, and that this is a brain function, developed with the brain and suffers the fate of the brain.

We may hope. We may conjecture. We may make deductions from analogy; but after all we remain agnostic.

ATHANASIAN, OR ARIAN, WHICH?

"Amid the herd the leopard knows his kind,
The tiger preys not on the tiger brood;
Man only is the common foe of man."

—*Juvenal.*

In the twilight zone of history, there looms up on the eastern horizon the lurid clouds of smoke and flame that tell us of the conflagration of war on the storied plains of Phrygia and before the walls of Troy. The arts of classic verse and sculpture have made immortal the deeds and the heroes of that eventful struggle.

Homer tells us that one of the princes of Troy, at the suggestion of the goddess Aphrodite, seized upon and carried away to Troy, the beautiful Helen of Lacedæmon, wife of Menelaus, and of the ten years' seige of Troy, by the Greeks, which followed. And Lucian describes to us, in the most engaging and lively manner, in his treatise entitled "Dialogues of the Gods," how Jupiter had, earlier, delegated to Paris, the Trojan prince, the interesting but dangerous office of examining the three reigning and jealous beauties of Heaven, Hera, Athena and Aphrodite, and of determining which was the most beautiful. And how, after a painstaking and minute investigation of their respective charms, he awarded the prize,—an apple with this inscription, "Let the beautiful one take me,"—to Aphrodite, after having first received from her a promise that she would assist him to seize and carry off to Troy, the far-famed and beautiful Helen. Wherein we see how great wars sometimes arise from small provocations.

The Council of Nicæa, held in A. D. 325, was presided over by Emperor Constantine. The ex-

citing scenes that arose in this great council were beyond the power of the historians of that day to comprehend and describe. Constantine was a soldier and a man of action. He found great joy in the din and turmoil of battle, in the excitement of the races in the hippodrome, and in the combats in the arena of the colosseum at Rome. So it was that he witnessed, with real barbaric pleasure, the struggle, the passion and the energy that were displayed before him, by this assembly of Greek bishops, as they grappled and jostled one another in their desire to reach the tribune and from it enter into the combat of words and ideas. The emperor was not familiar with the abstruse propositions and niceties of Greek logic, but, admiring the commotion, turned to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, who sat by his side and said: "Splendid! Splendid! what is it all about?" When this memorable convention had finally adopted a creed, and the majority had adopted resolutions anathematizing the minority, it was ascertained that, as a part of the fruit of the labor of the council, eighteen different, distinct and "jarring" sects had been born, and that the sectaries of each were in bitter hostility to all the others. In the fratricidal strife that followed, the real antagonists were the Athanasian, or orthodox party, and the followers of Arius, or the Arian party. The loss of life occasioned by the fierce and bloody strife between these parties from the date of the Nicene council to the as-

cension of Julian to the throne of Rome,—38 years—was greater than that of all the martyrdoms which had taken place under the pagan emperors from the beginning of the reign of Nero to the close of the reigns of Diocletian and Galerius, a period of 269 years.

In the fierce quarrels which arose between these sects, during those 38 years, the military forces of the empire were frequently called into use; now in the interest of one party and again in the interest of the other. Bishops were dragged from their episcopal thrones and hurried off to exile, or, as in case of Bishop George of Cappadocia, to execution. On one occasion in a street fight in Constantinople, the Orthodox party, the Arian party and the army were engaged and there were 3150 killed. At another time, the cathedral of Alexandria was besieged and broken into by the troops of Constantine; the congregation that had met to worship was engaged by the troops, a hand to hand battle followed, which did not end until the tessellated floor and pictured walls of the edifice were baptized in blood.

At this time the city of Alexandria was divided into two hostile camps. The followers of Athanasius, supporters of the Nicene creed, and the followers of Arius who opposed all those of that creed. Athanasius, foreseeing a conflict, and fearing that he might be overpowered by the Arian party, sent couriers out to the Monks, who at this time numbered thousands, and who were

living in sepulchral grottos in the desert around Thebes. These wild fanatics were marshalled in the cause of the trinitarians and came to the city as an army would come, singing their songs of war and religion with the refrain: "The Arians—The Arians—where are they!"

From the account given of this event it appears that these Monks were a hideous lot, dressed in skins of lions and leopards, with uncut hair falling over their shoulders and their long gray beards reaching to their waists. They came armed with clubs, which bristled with nails and when well within the city, they charged upon the Arians with yells and fury.

The slaughter begins.

The Arians are dislodged from their position.

Encouraged now by Athanasius, the Monks pursue and kill as they pursue. Returning, they pillage the shops and dwellings of the Jews, ransack the homes of the rich, drag the old men from their houses by their beards and throw them into the streets. Women with bare arms outstretched for mercy, and with tearful eyes raised imploringly, are outraged and then murdered. Children are thrown into cisterns, or brained in the presence of their mothers. The fury of the wild beasts of the desert was no more terrible than the rage of these Pauls and Anthonies of the Thebaid who could, when moved by zeal, kill, pillage and ravish with enthusiasm in the name of Jesus.

These conflicts were likewise carried into the

church councils. After the meetings were opened with prayer, and conciliatory speeches made, the sectaries would invariably precipitate serious trouble ending in personal encounters. At a council held at Ephesus about this time, Dioscorus, the patriarch of Alexandria, killed Florian, the patriarch of Constantinople—"by kicks and blows" in a most un-Christian-like manner.

In all parts of Egypt and the Asiatic provinces of the empire, and in parts of Europe, the destruction of property and slaughter went on until the loss of life exceeded that, which Homer tells us, occurred in the ten year seige of Troy.

Now, all this was occasioned by, and can be measured by, the difference in meaning of the two Greek adjectives; "*Homoousian*" and "*Homoiousian.*" I venture to state that no English scholar can pronounce these words that another can distinguish one from the other; but to those Greek casuists they had a different, if not a dark and sinister meaning. When these words were used to denote the relation of Jesus to God; of the Son to the Father; "*Homoousian*" meant, "of the substance of;" while "*Homoiousian*" meant, "of likeness to." The former is the orthodox view of Jesus in the trinity; the latter is the Arian view. This difference of opinion created two irreconcilable Christian bodies and the space of fifteen centuries has not healed the breach, nor bridged the chasm that separates them.

Thus we find that a more serious war and a

more prolonged struggle, grew out of the difference which exists in the meaning of two Greek words, than followed the rape of Helen of Lacedæmon.

"THEOTOKOS"

At the council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, it was decreed that Mary, the mother of Jesus, should be thenceforth known as the "Mother of God" and that she should be entitled to divine honors. This decree was reaffirmed at the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 441, and thus the formal worship of Mary became a part of the creed of the Catholic Church. The initiative in this was taken by the Greek bishops, led by St. Cyril of Alexandria. This is the St. Cyril who caused the murder of the beautiful and accomplished Hypatia. The opposition to the movement, for the worship of Mary, was led by Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, and by a presbyter named Anastasius. "Let no one call Mary the Mother of God," said Anastasius in the council, "for Mary was a human being; and that God should be born of a human being is impossible. . . . And we affirm that it is impossible that the God-head could either be born or made to suffer." A great uproar followed and Anastasius was threatened with ejection. Nestorius proposed the title "Mother of Christ," rather than "Mother of God." By fraud the "Nestorians" were defeated in the council, Nestorius was deposed from his episcopal throne at

Constantinople and sent into exile. The "Nestorian Creed," however, was soon developed and a very considerable body of Nestorian Christians settled in Syria and established schools and colleges there. These Christians have since spread over Arabia, Persia, and even into India and China,* and are an important body to this day, living among Mohammedans and Buddhists, yet without offending or closely affiliating with either.

It is quite proper that we should consider the influences that led to this important innovation. It is stated that the women of Constantinople met Nestorius on his return from the council at Ephesus, and expressed their displeasure at the position he had taken in the council, and that many met him "with jeers and ridicule." It is known that the emperor's sister was in sympathy with the mob, for she had been an advocate, for some time, of the proposition to worship Mary as the Mother of God. It is stated, too, that when Cyril came up to the council at Ephesus, a large concourse of women followed him from Alexandria, showing their interest and enthusiasm in the proposition; for had not Juno, the Queen of Heaven,

* A large monolith stands in the rear of a Buddha temple at Sian-fu, provincial capital of Shensi, north central China, erected A. D. 781, by Nestorian Christians to commemorate the results of their propaganda in that province. The inscriptions are in Syrian and Chinese characters and perfectly legible. A replica of this monolith may be seen at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

long been adored by the ancestors of these Greeks? Had not Ceres been celebrated at harvest time in songs and by offerings of grain, in temples that yet remained sequestered in fragrant groves in Greece! And here in Ephesus, the renowned Ephesus! were the descendants of those who had marched on festal days in throngs to the temple of Diana and, with chaplets on their brows, and with garlands in their hands, had joined in the tumultuous shout: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!"

It was here at Ephesus that the women crowded around their bishop, after the council had been adjourned, and with ecstatic joy and tears embraced his knees and received from him the glad assurance that the council had decreed that Mary was thenceforth to be known as "*Theotokos*,"—the Mother of God,—and that divine honors might now be paid to her as their ancestors had honored and adored Diana.

At Alexandria, at Carthage and over all of northern Africa, the desire to worship the Virgin had become insistent. Egypt was the birthplace of the "Divine Isis." Her image standing on the crescent moon, with her infant, Horus, at her breast, was ineffaceably stamped on the Tombs and Temples of Egypt, and on the minds and hearts of the sons and daughters of that mysterious land. What memories cluster around the shrine of this fruitful Goddess! How the mysteries of life and motherhood cling to her

skirts! The austere Christian Fathers of earlier periods had done much to rob the goddess of her ancient glory, but now she is to be given back to the daughters of Egypt under the new name and in the beautiful and artistic conception of the Madonna and Child! And so it came to pass that, after the council of Ephesus had made its decrees, that Isis was restored in Egypt under the name of Mary, the Mother of God.

St. Cyril and party now departed from Ephesus for Alexandria by ship. It was a merry party, made joyous by success and now its happiness was heightened by common congratulations. They sped over the sea with anticipations of a happy meeting with friends at Alexandria, and as they came into the harbor under the glare of the flaming cresset of burning pitch, which nightly burnt from the summit of Pharos, four hundred feet above the crested waves that washed the base of this magnificent Light-house, they knelt, while blending their voices softly in a litany to the Son and Virgin for having had a prosperous journey and a safe return. They were met at the mole by Peter the reader, a band of monks from Nitria and by thousands of zealous and enthusiastic Christians from the city, for the news of the result of the council at Ephesus had preceded them; and now the great crowd formed into line and moved up the broad street which led from the mole to the Greek section of the city; first passing by the slender marble col-

umns, at the quays, that lifted their heads far up above the mole and on which were perched bronze eagles with outstretched wings. Then along either side of this beautiful avenue, were set at regular intervals the marble statues of the Macedonian kings and the emperors of Rome; these St. Cyril and his followers passed unheeding by. Passing also the Palace of the Ptolemies,—embowered in palms and cypresses, by blooming lotus and a tarn. Then the Soma—containing the tomb of Alexander; the Museum, the Possidium, the Timonium, the Paneum and the ivory statue of Aphrodite; now passing through the somber shadows of the Temples of Osiris and Anubis; onward the chanting throng moved until it reached the Obelisks—that had been quarried and fashioned by the Pharoahs and transported thither from Heliopolis by Tiberius.[16] All these venerable works of a great people, and a mighty past, were not observed by Cyril and his unobserving zealots. The procession here reached its objective point at the Cæsarium,—a structure built for, and dedicated to, the formal worship of the emperors of Rome, but since the days of Constantine the Great, occupied by the Christians who made it the episcopal throne of Alexandria. The throng now comprised Christians of every caste and color; Jewish proselytes from Asia Minor, Greeks from

[16] One of these three obelisks was brought to New York and set up in Central Park in 1880, at the charges, and by the bounty of, W. H. Vanderbilt.

everywhere, Romans from Italy and Gaul; Anchorites from the Theban desert, all—all commingling marched round and round the Cæsarium singing, or chanting, the *Te Deum.*

The Marionites, a considerable body of Christians, regarded the trinity as comprising "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Virgin Mary." The Collyridians, another body of Christians, worshiped the Virgin as a divinity, offering sacrifices to her. The Simonians—a Gnostic Christian sect—held that the Holy Ghost was feminine, and worshiped her as the *Prounikos.*

The worship of Mary has continued from the day of that celebrated council of Ephesus down to our time. In 1864, His Holiness, the Pope, enjoins the worship of Mary in his celebrated "Encyclical Letter and Syllabus," in these words: "In order that God may accede the more easily to our and to your prayers let us employ in all confidence, as our mediatrix with Him, the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, who sits as queen on the right hand of her only (?) begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, in a golden vestment, clothed around by various adornments. There is nothing she cannot obtain from Him."

The Protestants ridicule the position which the Catholic Church has long maintained on this subject. They should remember, however, that the council of Ephesus was held long after the council of Nicæa (106 years later), in which the creed

of the Christian Church (which was the Catholic Church), was developed and affirmed. The proposition is, in fact, a logical deduction from the assumption that Jesus is the Son of God and, as expressed in the Nicene creed, "Very God of Very God," and likewise the Son of Mary. Now, if Mary is not the Mother of God, the error lies in the premises found in the creed referred to and not in the conclusion, alone, of the Syllogism,—which may be expressed thus:

Jesus Christ is Very God of Very God, Mary is the Mother of Jesus Christ, therefore Mary is the Mother of God.

Those who do not give assent to the Nicene creed need not, however, be perplexed over this complicated proposition. The popular demand for the worship of Mary, early in the fourth century, was born of superstition and inclination to idolatry, rather than of a desire based upon the logic of the situation.

There is no authentic record showing when or where Mary died, or where she was buried. There was published in the fourth century an account of the death of Mary which declares that: "The Apostles were miraculously assembled around her death bed at Bethlehem on the Lord's day, whereupon Christ descended with a multitude of angels and received her soul," etc. There is nothing in history, or tradition, to substantiate this account. We may safely conclude that it is wholly fictitious.

TOUCHING THE TRINITY

Great warriors and great statesmen live in history, because a greater than they lived to record their deeds and portray their motives. Men of action die and their works would be interred with their bones, were it not that men of letters snatch them from oblivion, or from the uncertainties of tradition, and make them and their deeds immortal.

Four hundred years before the Christian era, an Athenian taught his countrymen in the groves and in the porticos of Athens a profound philosophy, from which deductions have been made that have greatly influenced religious thought, the sciences and statesmanship. Out of the intellect of Plato, thoughts were externalized into form and attributes made persons, and from the realm of his imagination, or his metaphysics, substance and form came forth to bewilder but none the less charm us. From Plato's speculations in the "Timæus," and from his writings generally, he has not only perpetuated his own name and fame, but that also of the even more profound and original thinker, his countryman and friend —Socrates. The law of evolution appears to have taken up the conceptions of Plato and after they had been shaped and colored by the Stoics, became the philosophy of "Platonism." Here again we find personality given to principles. Coming down to the Christian era, in the

third century of the institution of the Schools of Alexandria, we find "New Platonism" in its early but rapid, stage of development, preceded and facilitated by the speculations of the great scholar and Helenic Jew—Philo. So by the time, and at the time, the New Testament books were written we find a "Logos" doctrine or philosophy well developed. To the Greek this meant personified Wisdom. To the Jew it meant personified Word. The theologians of the first, second and third centuries were evolved from the Greek philosophers. They ascribed to Jesus the embodiment of "The Wisdom," and "The Word" of God and He was spoken of as the "Logos."

The writer of St. John's Gospel was familiar with this Alexandrian philosophy. He begins his subject: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." In the "Acts of Paul" (a book no longer in the canon) the writer closes his argument touching Jesus: "And here is the Word a living being." And the Greek theologian Origen, writing on the same subject uses the phrase, "the Wisdom and the Word incarnate." We have seen how this idea was developed and how by changing the pronoun "it" to the pronoun "him," an attribute was transformed into a person.

Had the authors of the New Testament left Jesus thus portrayed to the world, allowances would have been made for the imagery of speech. His splendid personality would have been understood

and appreciated; but when the doctrine of His miraculous conception, and the details thereof, were made a part of His life, history and mission, the incomprehensible elements of mysticism were introduced and we have an individual that is half God and half man. This conception gave the critics and satirists of the second, third and fourth centuries occasion for ridicule and they were not slow to improve it.

Lucian, A. D. 120-195, gave the following parallel: in the mythology of the Greeks, Herakles was the son of the god Zeus, and his mother was a mortal. Now Lucian gives us a dialogue between Diogenes and Herakles which purports to have taken place in the after life, in Hades.—

DIOGENES: Is not this Herakles? O glorious victor, are you then a dead man? For I used to offer sacrifices to you above ground, as if you were divine.

HERAKLES: And you did perfectly right, for the true Herakles himself is in company of the gods in heaven while I his ghost am here.

DIOGENES: What! A ghost of a God? And is it possible for one to be a God in one-half of one's person and to have died in the other half?

HERAKLES: Yes, for he has not died, but I, his simulacrum.

DIOGENES: Your mother gave birth, you imply,

to two Herakleses at the same time, one by herself and one by Zeus.

HERAKLES: No, vain trifler, we both were one and the same person.

DIOGENES: It is not easy to understand this—that there were two Herakleses compounded into one, except perhaps that you had grown together, man and God.

HERAKLES: What, don't you suppose all men to be compounded of two parts, soul and body? What is to hinder the soul, which is from Zeus from being in heaven, while my mortal part from being with the dead?

DIOGENES: Nay, you are very near making Herakles into a trinity.

HERAKLES: How a trinity?

DIOGENES: In this way: if the one, whoever it is, is in heaven, and the one that is here is you the ghost, and your body which has already been buried at Alta, these surely are three. . . .

And that other proposition which was developed at and by the Nicene council,—that the Father and the Son, God and Jesus, are co-eternal and yet that the Son was begotten by the Father, and of the same substance of the Father,—was not easily explained to the "pagan" scholars of the fourth century.

The Arian party in the Nicene council opposed this doctrine. They affirmed that, "There was a

time when Jesus Christ was not"; that, "before He was begotten He was not"; that "He came into existence from what was not," and that, "He is of a different person or substance than God."

The quarrel that here arose shook the whole empire. The orthodox proposition was burlesqued upon the stage in Alexandria; Jesus was impersonated and his impersonator was questioned sharply by one assuming the character and dress of a Platonist philosopher. This quizzical examination was received by the audiences with tremendous laughter, and was what we would now call "a great hit," by the comedians of A. D. 325. This interlude was presented with variations but substantially and usually as follows:—

(Interlude)

PLATONIST: Is not thy name Jesus, and wast thou not born at Bethlehem in Judea when Herod the Great was king of the Jews?

JESUS: Yes.

PLATONIST: Didst thou not grow up to manhood and work at the carpenter's trade in the village of Nazareth?

JESUS: Yes.

PLATONIST: Whether wrongfully or not, wast thou not apprehended by thy countrymen at Jerusalem, and tried for a crime before the Sanhedrin and condemned, when Caiaphas was High Priest?

JESUS: Yes.

PLATONIST: And was not the judgment of the Sanhedrin acquiesced in by the procurator—Pontius Pilate, in the reign of Tiberius, and wast thou not crucified, when Herod was Tetrarch of Galilee?

JESUS: Yes.

PLATONIST: It has recently been affirmed at Nicæa by thy followers that thou art the Son of God, and that thou art of the same substance as that of God, and that thou art coeternal, or of the same age, as of God; now if thou wert begotten by the Father and yet art of the same age as the Father, this is hard to understand. Wilt thou not explain this riddle unto us?

A long silence, and then the curtain is drawn across the stage, and the merriment of the audience follows. Sacrilegious! Not at all. Consider that the audience was composed of wealthy Jews,—the merchants of Alexandria, Greek scholars and philosophers, and Roman magistrates. Pagans if you will have it so, but none the less they were the wealthy, the intellectual and the influential classes of that famous city at that time.

These problems are surrounded with many and inscrutable mysteries. The earliest and most concise definition or attempted definition, of this indefinable conception of the trinity, is one by Athanasius:—"We worship one God in trinity and

trinity in unity; neither confounding the person nor dividing the substance."

When we begin to reason of spiritual generation and of Infinite matter or substance, we soon find ourselves entangled in the meshes of the most incongruous abstractions and long to get our feet on firm ground. The doctrines of the trinity may be true, but they are beyond my comprehension.

VIII

DUALISM

Ah! when within our narrow room,
The friendly lamp again doth glow,
An inward light dispels the gloom
In hearts that strive themselves to know.
Reason begins again to speak,
Again the bloom of hope returns,
The stream of life we fain would seek,
Ah, for life's source our spirit yearns.

—*Faust.*

Early in the first century there was centered at Alexandria a group of scholars considering the problems suggested by the dualism apparent in nature. The minds of these Gnostics were ablaze with speculations on this subject and the influences arising therefrom spread out from Alexandria agitating powerfully the communities of the Levant. Two forces had become apparent and their relations sharply defined. By the Aryan cults these had been typified in Light and Darkness, and personified in Ormuzd and Ahriman. Platonism had drawn the line closely between Mind and Matter and had affirmed the separate and independent existence of the former. In the metaphysics of the schools, Good and Evil

had become something more than relative terms. Ethics had discovered and explored the kingdoms of the good and bad in human nature and conduct —Dualism was rampant. Twenty years earlier Jesus had been crucified at Jerusalem and now for the first time his doctrines were given to the Gentile world by the Apostle Paul, an apostate from orthodox Judaism. The propositions promulgated by Paul in the Greek cities of lower Asia, Greece and Italy were quickly and eagerly considered by the Gnostic school at Alexandria, from which many of the Fathers of the Christian Church were, later, graduated and who injected into the ethics of Jesus many foreign myths. Semitic monotheism was made to conform to Iranean and Greek polytheism and to assume the garb of Persian dualism. In the light of these important principles given to the ethics of Jesus the gospels were written, and by an extension of this likeness the Greek bishops of Africa, who were in control of Church councils for the first three centuries, built up a system, in many ways resembling earlier cults. Catholic Christianity appropriated much from Platonism, Mazdeism, Manichæism, Gnosticism and Judaism, not alone in doctrines and rites, but also in personalities. The Messiah, or Christ, of Catholic Christianity, the Primitive Man of Manichæism, of the Ebionites and of Gnostic Christianity, and the Logos of Platonism, had their models in the demi-gods of all mythologies, in Melchizedek and the "Sons of

God" of the Pentateuch and Mithra in Iranean Mithraism. Likewise Mary of Catholic Christianity, Helena of the Samaritan Christian Gnostics and Sophia of the Greek, and the Great Mother of the Manichæans, had their prototypes in Ishtar of Babylonia, Astarte and Aphrodite of Syria, Athena of Greece, Isis of Egypt. Christianity thus became a syncretism of the doctrines of other and earlier cults, holding to pagan polytheism and Persian dualism.—Christ and the Holy Ghost in the Christian trinity were in this manner made persons and not attributes.

Dualism, or its opposite principle—monism, lies at the bottom of many important propositions in physics, is fundamental in metaphysics, ethics and theology. Let us call up a number of the truly great thinkers of the past that they may briefly and characteristically express, or reiterate, their opinions bearing on this subject.*—

BRAHMA (B. C. 4500).

"And the Supreme Brahma created the world, the seas, and the heavens above. And he made a man and a woman and put them on an island. And the island (Ceylon) was beautiful, for all manner of fruits and flowers grew upon it. And the Supreme Brahma was pleased with the man and woman whom he had created and said: 'Let them have a period of courtship, for it is my desire and will that true love shall forever precede

* Excerpts are set in quotation marks; epitomes of opinion are not.—THE PUBLISHERS.

marriage.' . . . Then these two were married by the Supreme Brahma and he named the man Adami, and the woman Heva and said to them: 'Remain here; you must not leave this island.' And in a short time after the Supreme Brahma had blest and left them, Adami said to Heva: 'I will go to the northward and see what lies beyond this island.' And so when Adami reached the end of the island the Devil produced a mirage and pictured to him a more beautiful land beyond. And Adami returned to Heva and said: 'The country over there is better than this, let us go thither.' And Heva said: 'No, we have all we need; let us remain here.' But Adami beckoned to her and said: 'We will go.' And so Heva followed him, and they came to a narrow neck of land and passed over, and lo! the neck of land was immediately submerged, the mirage disappeared and they stood on the mainland, and it was not as the Devil had portrayed, for it was rocky, barren and bleak. Then the Supreme Brahma approached and cursed them for their disobedience. And Adami raised his head and said: 'Curse me, but curse not the woman; it was not her fault, it was mine.' And the Supreme Brahma said: 'I will save the woman, but not thee.' Then the woman, in tears, spake and said: 'If thou wilt not spare him, neither me; I do not wish to live without him, for I love him.' Then the Supreme Brahma had compassion for them and said: 'I will spare you both, and watch over

you and your children forever, and the Evil One shall not again deceive you.' "

MOSES (B. C. 1300).

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. . . . Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest of it thou shalt surely die."

ZOROASTER (B. C. 1000).

Good and evil powers have existed from all eternity. From the conflict between these powers came the visible creation, and all animated things are stamped with the characteristics of these opposing and creative forces. Man is free to choose between them; in the end Light shall prevail over Darkness,—Ormuzd shall vanquish Ahriman.

MITHRA (B. C. 900).

Is not fire the source of all sensation? And if of sensation is it not the origin of thought?

BUDDHA (B. C. 650).

Ah! it was under the Bo-tree I conquered the Powers of Darkness and attained Nirvana. The senses and reason are inadequate, I believe in the essence of things—the illusion of forms.

THALES (B. C. 640).

Water is the source or principle of all life.

The world floats on this elemental fluid and appears to be impregnated and energized by spirit.

PYTHAGORAS (B. C. 580).

Infinity may be demonstrated by numbers; transmigration and immortality of soul may be inferred. We are indissolubly connected with and related to all forms of terrestrial life. Be kind to animals, love the blooming and fruitful tree!

CONFUCIUS (B. C. 550).

I believe in the unity of the Supreme Being: The brotherhood of man should be realized in our minds and hearts.—"*What you do not like when done to yourself, do not do to others.*"

ANAXIMENES (B. C. 520).

Air is the source of life, when we breathe we inhale universal life.

HERACLITUS (B. C. 500).

Universal reason pervades nature and becomes conscious in man. Eternal flux and change the sole actuality—there is no rest or quiet.

XENOPHANES (B. C. 500).

There is one God, greatest among gods and men, neither in shape nor in thought like unto mortals. There is unity in being—the all is One and the One is God. Apparent diversity of being is but attributes of being.

EMPEDOCLES (B. C. 490).

In all things I see two principles, one is Love and the other Hate. One attracts, the other repels. Love holds to unity, hate ends in segregation and dissolution. Make reason your master, do not trust the evidence of your senses.

SOCRATES (B. C. 471).

Moral distinctions are real and possibly eternal. The aim of philosophy is to attain knowledge of right conduct. Truth realized in speculation is science.

DEMOCRITUS (B. C. 470).

Do not look in the clouds for Deity, behold him in the atom! If you are immortal it is because the atoms of which your body is composed are psychic. There are but two things in the universe,—atoms and the void.

PLATO (B. C. 427).

We can affirm nothing of matter, mind is the sole reality—ideas alone exist.

ARISTOTLE (B. C. 384).

Right action is prudential, evil lies in extremes. Excellence grows by the contemplation of perfection and the beautiful. Intellect, or spirit, and sense must ever be corporeal.

PYRRHO (B. C. 360).

It is vain to speak of dualism in nature when we know nothing of nature; we have no sure tes-

timony even to the reality of things less hidden and less remote. We can not rely on the evidence of our senses else objects would not appear differently to different individuals. We can not rely on our judgment, for the judgments of men on even commonplace subjects and touching familiar objects do not agree, and reason is not uniform in her conclusions. We do not know if the qualities we ascribe to objects really appertain to them or depend upon our senses—whether they are in the objects or in our minds. We have absolutely no criterion of truth, therefore we can affirm nothing!

EPICURUS (B. C. 342).

There is no dualism in matter; all that exists is corporeal—the intangible does not exist. Sensation is a property of matter.

CICERO (B. C. 106-45).

(*From his Vision of Scipio*)

"Do not consider yourself, but your body, to be mortal. For you are not the being which this corporeal figure evinces; but the mind of every man is the man, and not that form which may be delineated with a finger. Know therefore that you are a divine person. Since it is divinity that has consciousness, sensation, memory, and foresight,—that governs, regulates, and moves that body over which it has been appointed, just as the Supreme Deity rules the world; and in like manner as an eternal God guides this world, which in

some respects is perishable, so an eternal spirit animates your frail body."

LUCRETIUS (B. C. 98-55).

From space and atoms came visible creation. Animal and vegetable life arose from heat and moisture. Spirit is a property of matter. There is no evidence of a future life.

JESUS OF NAZARETH.

And the devil took me up into a high mountain and showed me all the kingdoms of the world and said unto me: "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whom-so-ever I will give it. If thou, therefore, will worship me, all shall be thine." And I said unto him, get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve.

SAINT CLEMENT OF ROME (A. D. 96-?).

Behold! I see God standing in the clouds, with outstretched arms, holding Jesus in his right hand and Satan in his left!

JUSTIN MARTYR (A. D. 100-167).

The Hebrew prophecies are fulfilled in Jesus. Jesus is the Logos of Plato. The Kingdom of righteousness shall prevail.

SAINT IGNATIUS (A. D. 117?).

The world is in the grip of death, the Powers of Darkness envelop it. By sacrifice alone can

righteousness be made a saving power among men; we shall find God and Jesus in martyrdom. "Come fire and cross and grapplings with wild beasts, wrenching of bones, hacking of limbs, crushings of my whole body; only be it mine to attain unto Jesus Christ."

LUCIAN (A. D. 120-180).

Good and evil principles are not inherent in nature, they are conventional in character. Banish man from the world and "Good and Evil" will no longer exist!

APULEIUS (A. D. 125-?).

Dualism is everywhere apparent. Every proposition that can be made has an opposite or contrary notion.

CELSUS (A. D. 178-?)

Why do the Jews mock the gods of the Greeks? Before Moses they were polytheists; they believed in demons and magic, they had their oracles. They worshiped their Jehovah, demons and angels on Horeb, as the Greeks worship Zeus and the lesser divinities on Olympus. That Jesus, the Jew, is the Son of the Creator God and came to bind Satan is impossible,—hence by faith can only be believed!

SAINT CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (A. D. 150-230).

Good and Evil in their own natures are infinite, matter is eternal. Christianity is a philosophy.

Plato was an incarnation of Moses; the Logos is the Son of God.

TERTULLIAN (A. D. 155-220).

God and righteousness are enthroned above, Satan and the fires of hell rage beneath our feet!

ORIGEN (A. D. 185-254).

The Powers of Evil control us,—crucify the flesh—emasculate yourselves for Jesus' sake!

SAINT CYPRIAN (A. D. 200-258).

"We are but pilgrims and strangers here below, let us then welcome the day that gives to us the joys of heaven. What exile longs not for his native land? Our true native land is Paradise. A large and loving company expects us there. Oh, the bliss of those celestial realms where no fear of dying enters! There the glorious choir of the apostles, the exulting company of the prophets, the countless army of martyrs await us. To them let us eagerly hasten. Let us long to be with them the sooner, that we may the sooner be with Christ."

PLOTINUS (*Platonist* A. D. 204-270).

God lies beyond sense and imagination. He is unthinkable.

PORPHYRY (*Platonist* A. D. 233-304).

Infinity can not have personality.

MANI (A. D. 215-271).

Satan created man with evil nature but with in-

telligence; the Primal Man came to free him from his evil nature.

SAINT GREGORY (A. D. 325-389).

Away with the Arian heresy, it is the child of hell! Evil is the dominating power in the world, the good exists only in potentiality.

SAINT BASIL (A. D. 330-379).

Oh, for the memory of Constantine! Julian is the prince of darkness—evil incarnate. O God, let my days be spent in the grottos of Cappadocia removed from the presence of the evil one!

SAINT JEROME (A. D. 340-420).

God and righteousness may be found in the monastery. O women, if you would cherish the virginity of Mary sequester yourselves from Satan and the world! Heresy is everywhere. Origen was a heretic. The Gnostics were corruptors of the word. Christian doctrine was defined at Nicæa. To perdition with the Arians!

SAINT AUGUSTINE (A. D. 354-430).

When I would do good evil is present, the lusts of the flesh beset me. "O Lord, make me pure and chaste—but not yet"!

PELAGIUS (A. D. 360-420).

Away with the doctrine of Original Sin, of Total Depravity. The human soul is created as innocent as Adam was on the day of his creation. Sin came from ignorance, it is not inherent in our

nature. Death is not the penalty of sin but is the law of nature.

PRISCILLIAN (A. D. ——?-385).

Live in contemplation of the goodness of God. Out upon marriage and carnal pleasures; it is the devil who made the world!

POPE GREGORY THE GREAT (A. D. 540-604).

The worship of the gods is devil-worship. To read pagan authors is to mingle the praises of Jupiter and Jesus. The oracles of God are sufficient, we no longer need the works of the philosophers and grammarians. Emperor Theodosius destroyed the library and serapeum of Alexandria; Zeno burnt the library of Constantinople and that of Nisibis. Inspired by the example of these Christian princes let us put the torch to the library of Augustus yonder on the Palatine!

MAHOMET (A. D. 567-632).

I believe in the unity of God.—"O my sons give not a partner unto God for polytheism is a great impiety"!

SCOTUS ERIGENA (A. D. 800-887).

Theology and true philosophy are one. Evil is a variant of good, hell is in the mind. Devils are angels temporarily gone astray. All creation is approaching a divine and harmonious unity.

AVICENNA (A. D. 980-1037).

I believe in the unity of God as the Koran

teaches. I believe in the unity of the intellect—that my intellect is a part of the universal intellect. I believe with many of the Greeks that God and the universe are One and that all creation is an emanation from Him.

ABELARD (A. D. 1079-1142).

The Persons in the Trinity are attributes only. Satan is personified evil.

AVERROES (A. D. 1126-1198).

I believe in the unity of God. The spirit is immortal, its transition from the individual to the universal is instantaneous at death.

EMPEROR FREDERICK II (A. D. 1194-1250).

I hold to the unity of God and Nature. It is impossible that the Creator God can have been born of woman. The world has been deceived by three:—Moses, Jesus and Mahomet.

SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS (A. D. 1227-1274).

My body is matter differentiated and individualized. It is not to be reckoned as universal matter. So with my spirit it will retain its personality and will not be lost in universal spirit. There is perfect harmony between reason and faith.

DANTE (1265-1321).

Good and Evil, God and Devil, Paradise and Hell are as real to me as are the Gulps and Ghibellines—the "Blacks and Whites." . . .

I saw disembodied souls in the torments of material fire! I saw the spirits of departed friends lying on the shores of Purgatory suffering the stings and bites of material insects! And in Paradise? Ah, Paradise!—There is Beatrice, there the Holy Church Triumphant, there is Love, divine and immortal love—"The love that moves the sun and other stars"!

PETRARCH (1304-1374).

Cogito, ergo Deus est.

That God exists is a rational intuition. I believe in the dualism of Mind and Matter, of Good and Evil. Matter may be one attribute of spirit but spirit can not be alone a property of matter. Spirit is transcendently and gloriously above this cold insensate world of matter. . . . O glorious and immortal Cicero! I follow in thy footsteps and crave to attain thy virtues. The Rome that thou didst love so well is vanishing. The world's new birth is dawning; would that I could give inspiration and direction to it as thou didst give ideals to thy countrymen and to the wise and great of all subsequent time.

BOCCACCIO (1313-1375).

It is love that subdues and shackles evil.—Romantic love, the love of Fiammatta, of Aucassin and Nicolette.—The redeeming and saving love of Jesus for a dying world—the all transforming and transfiguring love!

ST. CATHERINE OF BOLOGNA (1413-1463).

That the Powers of Darkness do prevail on earth I right well do know. By prayer to the saints in purgatory we are saved from venial and mortal sins. Those in purgatorial expiation are nearest us and know our temptations,—they hear and answer prayer!

TORQUEMADA (1420-1498).

Your belief destines your immortal soul to either heaven or hell. God is just, it is not He but your opinions that seal your fate. Those who deny or ignore the mercies of the Church should be given a foretaste of the suffering that awaits them.—Away with the heresiarchs to the torture-chamber of the Inquisition! To the rack with the schismatics, apostates, infidels and heretics! punch out their eyes,—cut out their tongues, —will they not now renounce their error? Will they not recant?—Thrust firebrands beneath their legs!

MACHIAVELLI (1469-1527).

Human nature is essentially evil. Evil predominates in the natural world. The good is a negative condition—the absence of evil. Self interest is of first importance, this must find its glory in the state. Fortify yourselves against the perfidy of others by anticipation and deception,—the end justifies the means. Encourage commerce that the people may be kept busy making money and out of politics. Foster religion

among the masses that they may be held submissive and obedient!

COPERNICUS (1473-1543).

The world and its teeming life are mere incidents in the great scheme of the Solar System. This planet is moving swiftly through space in a well defined orbit around the sun, and there are other suns and revolving worlds. Pythagoras was right, Ptolemy and the Church wrong. I believe in matter and force, in motion and inertia.

CORREGGIO (1494-1534).

God is to be found in art. The beautiful is the good and this is revealed in form and color. I discern harmony in the dualism of nature and art.

BRUNO (1548-1600).

The unity of Mind and Matter is a fact of all existence.

BACON (1561-1626).

Science is iconoclastic,—down with your idols! If you would learn truth interrogate Nature and her laws. Human nature cannot become altruistic. Individual happiness is the end of ethics. Good and Evil are relationships rather than essences.

CAMPANELLA (1568-1639).

There is no such thing as dead matter. God

is sensation and sensation pervades all elements and all compounds. The physical universe palpitates with life—life seeking expression in form. The unity of all things is an ultimate fact.

HOBBS (1588-1697).

There was no difference between men and tigers until the policeman made a difference. Moral distinctions largely arise from the civil laws, Good and Evil are relative terms.

DESCARTES (1596-1650).

Je pense, donc je suis.

I renounce all authority which comes from tradition. Truth lies in method. I believe in the unity and uniformity of Nature, and that the solar system was evolved from vortices of nebular matter, that there is only motion and extension in the objective world. Heat, odor, taste, light, sound, resistance and weight—qualities we attribute to bodies—are really in ourselves, we simply conceive them in relation to ourselves. Attributes cannot exist apart from their substance, spirit is an attribute. True, Mersenne, the Church believes otherwise and we must not oppose the Church for she is doubtless right! Galileo has seen too much through his telescope. Word has reached me from Rome that he must soon appear before the Inquisition. We must be careful!

SPINOZA (1632-1677).

God exists only as realized in the Cosmos. The

Cosmos exists only as a manifestation of God.—God and Nature are one.

LOCKE (1632-1704).

Good and Evil have their equivalents in pleasure and pain. The rule of probability should be applied to all propositions in theology or religion. Ideas are not innate but acquired.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON (1642-1727).

Law is everywhere visible in nature,—cause and effect may be discerned throughout the universe.

LEIBNITZ (1646-1716).

Space and time are merely relative, the former an order of co-existence, the latter of successions. The world is composed of infinite individual substances or monads, these are forces in nature. I believe in the dualism of motion and inertia. Good and Evil exist, how would we know the good were it not for the presence of evil?

VOLTAIRE (1694-1778).

If matter be infinite it has one of the attributes of the Supreme Being. If a void be impossible then matter exists of necessity and has existed from all eternity. . . . Our knowledge of Christian revelation is based on tradition, tradition is a medley of fact and fiction. Satan? There is no such animal known in flesh or fossil!

SAINT BEAUVE (1664-1739).

One God, one Christ, one Bishop, one King,

this is the ideal condition. Attain this and we shall overcome all evil!

MILTON (1608-1674).

"One Almighty is from whom
All things proceed, and up to Him return,
If not depraved from good; created all
Such to perfection, one first matter all,
Endued with various forms, various degrees
Of substance, and, in things that live, of life;
But more refined, more spiritual, and pure,
As nearer to Him placed, or nearer tending
Each in their several active spheres assigned,
Till body up to spirit work, in bounds
Proportioned to each kind." . . .

FENELON (1651-1751).

The principles of Good and Evil are as old as Adam, they were planted in Eden. Overcome evil with good thoughts and good works. Perfection lies in denial of self-hood—Christ is *the* redeemer, not *my* redeemer.

SWEDENBORG (1688-1772).

I hear voices from the spirit world. The Lord has manifested himself to me in person: I have seen heaven and hell with my own eyes! I have been commissioned by the Lord to teach his doctrines.

BERKELEY (1685-1753).

Sensible qualities are nothing else than ideas.

The soul is that unextended thing which thinks, acts and perceives.

HUME (1711-1776).

Reason cannot transcend experience. There is no evidence of design in nature, no proof of a creator God. Religion is the child of fear.

THOS. JEFFERSON (1743-1826).

Happiness consists in the tranquillity of the mind,—happiness the aim of life; virtue the foundation of happiness, utility the test of virtue. All religions are of tradition.

LAVOISIER (1743-1794).

I discern life in the minerals of which the earth's crust is formed,—God is in the molecules of the crystal! I think I hear the atom say: I live! I give the molecules of matter geometric form, structure, gravity, polarity, motion. I am in the nebulæ, the gases, the aqueous vapor. I am in the primary substances of which the suns and planets are composed. I am in the molecules of all compounds, in those of the minerals that form the rocks of which the crust of the earth is composed. I reveal intelligence in the crystal!

BENTHAM (1748-1832).

Good and Evil are terms reducible to pleasurable and painful consequences. The character of all acts should be determined by their consequences. A near good as in egoistic hedonism

cannot be a chief good, it lacks in ultimate and general utility.

LAMARCK (1744-1829).

Form and structure are changed to conform to a persistent want, horns and claws have grown for defense. The Giraffe's neck has been lengthened by persistent stretching and desire to feed on the leaves and buds of the trees. Desires and acquired character are transmitted. The law of evolution is the law of nature.

GOETHE (1749-1832).

Nature is spirit visible; spirit is invisible nature. Man is but a part of the cosmos, he cannot rise above nor go beyond the limitations of his nature. His fate lies hidden in the yet unperceived forces of evolution.

LAPLACE (1749-1827).

God is in the nebula. Give me space and nebula and I can make revolving suns and planets!

HUMBOLDT (1769-1859).

The unity of external nature may be inferred from an analysis of its component factors. God is to be found in this unity and his essence discerned diffused in the homogeneity of the cosmos.

SCHELLING (1775-1854).

The physical world is an organism, it has vitality, it is sentient. Vegetable and animal life arose

out of the infusorial slimes. "Matter is frozen spirit, the cosmos a syncretism."

AUGUSTE COMTE (1798-1857).

We should not look for design in nature so much as law.

HEGEL (1770-1831).

. . . Mind and matter are phenomenal modifications of the common substance.

SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON (1778-1856).

The common sense of mankind assures us of the existence of an external and extended world, however, nothing exists for us except in so far as it is known to us,—consciousness is co-extensive with knowledge. . . . The Absolute and the Infinite can each only be conceived as a negation of the thinkable.

VICTOR HUGO (1802-1885).

The existence of a Deity is not an intuition but inference.

JOHN STUART MILL (1806-1873).

Good and Evil exist in nature. God is good, therefore God is not omnipotent.

STRAUSS (1808-1874).

Jesus of Judea was made to fulfill the expectation of the Jews who were looking for a king. He was made to fit the speculations of the Platonists and Gnostics. The doctrines of Mithra were pinned to Him and He is made to

stand for myths and symbolism. I believe in the "dualism" of religion and philosophy.

BLACKIE (1809-1895).

Morals vary under varying conditions of society as landscapes vary under changing conditions of solar light. Good and Evil are variable terms.

SCHLEIDEN-SCHWANN (1804-1882).

Life, sensation and intelligence may be discerned in the plant.—God is in the nucleus of the protoplasmic cells of which the structure of the living plant is composed.

Many plants have these functions:—The sense of sight, they perceive light and turn towards it. The sense of touch and attach themselves to objects. The sense of taste, are insectivorous—carnivorous. Are mobile and have the faculty of choosing and determining direction. They have sex and sex sensation. They are susceptible to stimulation and irritation. Plant protoplasm possesses an inherent tendency towards higher organization and there is no fundamental difference between the living substance of plants and animals.

DARWIN (1809-1882).

The end of morality is the conservation and preservation of life, it is therefore utilitarian. Creation is explained by the laws of evolution. From the lowest forms of sea organisms came, in

order, Fishes, Amphibians, Reptiles, Birds, Marsupials, Mammals, Lemurs, Simians, Man. I disbelieve the Mosaic account of creation.

HERBERT SPENCER (1820-1903).

Our ideas are not innate,—they are the result of accumulated racial experiences now inherited. Conduct is good or bad according as its total effects are pleasurable or painful. The constant and vital element in religion is mystery. God is the unknowable. The reality underlying appearances is totally and forever inconceivable by us. The persistence of force is the ultimate basis of knowledge. While all is change yet there is constancy in the quantitative aspects of phenomena.

BÜCHNER (1824-1899).

I believe in the unity and infinitude of matter and force. Matter in its last analysis is Motion, and Motion is nothing else than Mind.

HUXLEY (1825-1895).

It is conceivable that there should be no evil in the world, that which is conceivable is certainly possible; if it were possible for evil to be non-existent, the maker of the world, who, though foreknowing the existence of evil in the world, did not prevent it, either did not desire it should not exist or could not prevent its existence.

INGERSOLL (1833-1899).

"We need no myths, no miracles, no gods, no devils."

HAECKEL (1834- ——).

God is in the protoplasm,—in the cell. Animals (including man) and plants are composed of elementary organisms endowed with the attributes of life. Man is the product of evolution, differentiated from inorganic substances by the chemical properties of the protoplasm in the living cells of which his body is composed. Mind is the phenomenon of brain cells and its fate is that of the brain. Disintegration and reconstruction is the order of all organisms. Reconstruction in excess of disintegration is growth, disintegration in excess of reconstruction points to death and dissolution.

HENRI BERGSON (contemporary).

Mind and matter have a common ancestry. Life is, more than anything else, a tendency to act on inert matter. Evolution is not effected by external and extraneous influences; it is due to an internal and psychological principle inherent in living organisms. This principle is dominant, transcendent and creative.

Standing in the presence of these renowned scholars and thinkers, representatives of the scholarship of all historic time, and listening to their reiterated several and often contrary opinions, one feels that he dare not dogmatize on this important subject. I sympathize with Pyrrho and his school of skeptics,—that there is no criterion of truth. However, it is our privilege, and duty

perhaps, to give serious consideration to the problems involved and endeavor to solve them. The doctrine of the "Powers of Darkness" characteristic of theology and Christian ethics, inherited from Mazdeism, needs no consideration in this age of enlightenment. We know of no such powers. Darkness is but the absence of light—the natural condition of space, where not illuminated by radiant suns.

However deeply seated in the human mind and breast the moral sense is now found, the good and evil, the right and wrong in morals are conditions largely created by the conventions of society and the laws of states. Hobbs says truly: "There was no difference between men and tigers until the policeman made a difference." And we may likewise agree with Lucian in affirming that were man banished from the world evil would go with him.

Notwithstanding the apparent antagonism in nature we cannot say that nature is immoral. It is rather un-moral. Standing aside and contemplating the world as a revolving planet swiftly flying in its orbit through space, such subjective relationships as East and West disappear. So when we steadfastly fix our attention on the operation of the laws of external nature we observe that the cruelty of tooth and claw is lost in an appetite seeking its prey.

But that phase of dualism, a subject of metaphysics is much deeper.—Materialism says, Mind

is Matter. Idealism affirms, Matter is Mind. If God is different in substance from the universe, He is the God of dualism. If He is of the same substance with the universe, He must be the God of Pantheism—of monism—*Who knows?*

. . . . . .

I do not seek to detract from the mission and influence of the Church. It has been built up by sacrifices and nurtured for centuries by the best thoughts and emotions we possess. It has been adorned by the highest beauty of art and her greatest work is yet to be done. This will come when she shall have turned her back on the mysticism and follies of her youth and given attention to moral and intellectual work. The supernaturalism and mysticism of Christianity, inherited from the Temples, belong to dreamy orientalism. These form no part of ethics and are not necessary to religion.

I close this inquiry with this sentiment from an aphorism of Kant: "Two things fill my soul with wonder and reverence, increasing ever more as I meditate more closely upon them: the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me."